


NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 08178437 7



George Bancroft

THE
DAILY
AFR.
1911



Wilh. Hesse
Jen. Math.

A

H I S T O R Y

OF THE

SECOND CHURCH, OR OLD NORTH,

I N B O S T O N.

TO WHICH IS ADDED,

A HISTORY OF THE NEW BRICK CHURCH.

WITH ENGRAVINGS.

BY CHANDLER ROBBINS,

MINISTER OF THE SECOND CHURCH.

Published by a Committee of the Society.

BOSTON:

PRINTED BY JOHN WILSON & SON,


22, SCHOOL STREET.

1852.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1851, by

CHANDLER ROBBINS,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.



FREEMAN PLACE, *Boston, June 18, 1851.*

Rev. Chandler Robbins.

Dear Sir, — At a Special Meeting of the “Standing Committee” of the Second Church, held in the vestry last evening, the following votes were unanimously adopted; and the undersigned were appointed a Committee to transmit the same to you, and to solicit a compliance with the request.

With sentiments of the deepest affection and respect,

We remain truly yours, &c.

F. W. LINCOLN, jun.,	}	<i>Committee.</i>
DAVID BARNARD,		
HENRY DAVIS,		

“*Voted*, That the thanks of the Standing Committee be presented to our Pastor for the able and interesting Historical Discourses preached by him on the last sabbath, in commemoration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of our Church; and that he be requested to furnish a copy for the press, together with such other matter as he may deem advisable, connected with the early annals of our ancient Society.

“*Voted*, That a Committee of three be appointed, in connection with our Pastor, to superintend the publication of the Discourses.”

P R E F A C E.

THE substance of this HISTORY OF THE SECOND OR OLD NORTH CHURCH was embodied in two discourses preached at the celebration of its Two Hundred and First Anniversary. The original form in which the material was cast, to adapt it to delivery from the pulpit, has been generally preserved, though not strictly adhered to. Wherever it seemed necessary or proper, in making alterations or additions, to recognize the fact that I was preparing a volume for publication, I have done so.

A division into three periods has been made, partly for the convenience of the reader, and partly for the sake of typographical neatness.

The engravings have been prepared for the work by artists of the highest reputation, at the urgent request of the Society. It would have been more agreeable to me to have introduced portraits of *all* the pastors, both of the Second Church and the New Brick, could they have been obtained, and had it not been for the great expense which so many engravings would have involved. A selection was absolutely necessary, and the Committee of Publication made it. Otherwise the last portrait in the book would have been omitted.

A brief history of the New Brick Church, to which an explanatory note is prefixed, follows that of the Old North.

Considerable matter has been thrown into an Appendix. The temptation was strong to increase it, and was resisted only by considering that the purpose of this book was not the gratification of an antiquarian taste. The value of the long catalogue of "Admissions and Baptisms," in connection with the Second Church, will be appreciated by every genealogist.

CONTENTS.

HISTORY OF THE SECOND CHURCH.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION TO DISCOURSE	1
FIRST PERIOD, from 1650 to 1723	4
John Mayo	9
Increase Mather	12
SECOND PERIOD, from 1723 to 1768	67
Cotton Mather	67
Joshua Gee	115
Samuel Mather	120
Samuel Chickley	123
THIRD PERIOD, from 1768 to 1851	125
John Lathrop	125
Henry Ware, jun.	130
Ralph Waldo Emerson	142
Chandler Robbins	143

HISTORY OF THE NEW BRICK CHURCH.

PREFATORY NOTE	167
William Waldron	181
William Welsted	183
Ellis Gray	184
Ebenezer Pemberton	189

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX TO HISTORY OF THE SECOND CHURCH	209
Covenant	209
Michael Powell's Letter to the Governor and Magistrates	210
Will of Increase Mather	212
Table of the Mather and Cotton Lineage	215

	PAGE
Increase Mather's Family Record, from his Family Bible	216
Notice of Cotton Mather's Writings	217
Form of Union between the Second Church and the New Brick	220
Mr. Robbins's Letter of Resignation to the Proprietors of the New	
Meeting-house	222
Admissions and Baptisms in the Second Church	226
Curious Case of Conscience of John Farnum	291
Interesting and Curious Votes	296
Bill of Fare for Ordination, 1722	298
Deacons of the Second Church	298
Legacies and Donations to the Second Church	299
Address to the Congregation to excite them to raise the Minis-	
ter's Salary	300
Mr. Emerson's Ordination	301
Mr. Robbins's Ordination	301
Restored Covenant of the Second Church	301
Library of the Church	302
Description of the Communion Plate	302
Social Festival at the Two Hundred and First Anniversary	303
Hymn written for the Festival	305
APPENDIX TO HISTORY OF THE NEW BRICK CHURCH	306
Notice of Pamphlets relating to Mr. Thacher's leaving Wey-	
mouth	306
Speech of the Auctioneer on selling the Old Clock	308
Names of Original Associates who built the New Brick Church . .	309
Ordination and Genealogical Notice of William Waldron	309
Mr. Welstead's Ordination	310
Letters of Waldron. — Description of Prof. Wigglesworth. —	
Meeting of the Overseers of Harvard College, 1723. — Mr.	
Gee's Ordination. — Christ Church. — Rev. Mr. Rogers, of	
Portsmouth. — Mr. Wigglesworth's "Sober Remarks." — Sa-	
lute on Sunday	310
Rev. William Hooper	314
Ordination and Genealogical Notice of Ellis Gray	314
Death and Funeral of Ellis Gray	315
Notices of Dr. Pemberton and Sundry Votes	316
Notices of Deacons Tudor and Parkman	317
Memoranda and Votes	319

HISTORY OF THE SECOND CHURCH.

HISTORY

OF

THE SECOND CHURCH.

EZRA, ix. 8, 9. — AND NOW GRACE HATH BEEN SHOWNED FROM THE LORD OUR GOD; FOR OUR GOD HATH NOT FORSAKEN US, BUT HATH EXTENDED MERCY TO US, TO GIVE US A REVIVING, TO SET UP THE HOUSE OF OUR GOD, AND TO REPAIR THE DESOLATIONS THEREOF, AND TO GIVE US A WALL IN JUDAH AND JERUSALEM.

Two hundred and one years ago, this very day, the Second Church in Boston was gathered.* We feel it to be both a sacred duty and a high privilege to set apart this occasion to a review of its history, and a commemoration of the dealings of God with our fathers and their children.

* The Second Church was gathered on the fifth day of June, 1650. This discourse was preached June 15, 1851.

For the sake of those who may not understand this apparent confusion of dates, a brief explanation of the differences of style is subjoined. The mode of reckoning time adopted by Julius Cæsar was used in England, and in this country, till 1752. The Julian year consisted of 365 $\frac{1}{4}$ days, and, consequently, differed from the true solar year (365 days, 5 hours, 48 minutes, 49-62 seconds) by an excess of 11 minutes, 10-35 seconds. This small annual excess, in the course of centuries, produced a difference of several days between the solar and civil years. In 1582,

At the commencement of the third century, our harps were hanging upon the willows. Our affairs were not in a condition to authorize the celebration of a jubilee, or to make it certain that a kind Providence intended "to give us a reviving, to set up the house of our God." In silence, therefore, we passed over that anniversary; though not in gloom, for even then beams of promise were breaking upon our future path, and that happy arrangement was already begun, whose consummation a few months ago has given us a secure "wall," as of old, in the city of our delight.

But we must pause for one moment, as we turn our thoughts backward. We cannot chain them to separate facts in this long history, till we have first indulged the feeling that comes over us so powerfully, on finding ourselves once more established in safety and joy, after all our wanderings and trials. It is kindred to that which rose in the hearts of "ransomed Israel," when, coming up from the divided sea, their feet stood once more upon the dry land. It is of mingled adoration and wonder

Pope Gregory XIII., finding the difference to have greatly increased, sought to correct the error by dropping ten days from the calendar. This Gregorian calendar was at once adopted by all the *Roman Catholic countries*. But the *Protestant States* of Germany and the kingdom of Denmark adhered to the old Julian method till 1700; and England, with its colonies, till 1752. By act of Parliament in that year, the Julian calendar, or *Old Style*, as it was called, was abolished, and the date used in public documents made to conform to that employed in other European countries, by dropping eleven days, and calling the day following the second of September, 1752, the fourteenth of September.

To adjust the difference between the Old Style and the New, ten days are to be added to any date from 1600 to 1700, and eleven days to a date from 1700 to Sept. 14, 1752.

and gratitude. And it can find no better utterance, — none more grateful to itself, or more pleasing, perhaps, to Him to whom it rises, — than in the consecrated words of the very same psalm to which the ear of God then graciously listened, and whose glad peals echoed from the Red Sea behind to the wilderness of Shur before, when Moses sang, and all the men joined in chorus; while Miriam and all the women, with their timbrels, responded, — “The Lord hath triumphed gloriously. The Lord is my strength and my song; and he is become my salvation. He is my God, and I will prepare him an habitation; my fathers’ God, and I will exalt him. Who is like unto thee, O Lord! among the gods? Who is like thee, glorious in holiness, fearful in praises, doing wonders?”

The old field from which I have gleaned a few sheaves has been partially reaped before. Thirty years ago, at the completion of a century from the building of the Old Meeting House in Hanover-street, — now removed from our eyes, but never to be displaced from our hearts, — two discourses were preached by Rev. Henry Ware, jun.; one on the history of the New Brick Church, and the other on that of the Old North, or Second Church. Like every thing else which he undertook, that commemorative work was well done. But it is obvious, that within the limits of a single sermon it would be impossible to recount every particular worth remembering throughout the long period which he reviewed. Besides, his interesting discourses are not now to be procured; whilst several sources of information, not accessible to him, have come to light since he

wrote, and events of no inconsiderable moment to this church have contributed a painful interest to the close of its second century.

For these reasons, as well as from respect to the general request of this congregation, it has seemed to me not only proper, but necessary, that I should undertake to lay before you a thorough and minute history of our venerable church.

FIRST PERIOD.

FROM THE INSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH, 1650, TO 1723.

JOHN MAYO.—INCREASE MATHER.

FROM the first settlement of Boston, not twenty years had elapsed at the period when our history begins. But, in that short interval, a wonderful change had been effected in the aspect of this little peninsula. Tangled thickets had given place to pleasant streets, dark forests to smiling gardens, and barren wastes to fruitful fields. Low cabins and tents of cloth had been exchanged for large dwellings and convenient stores, some even of brick and tile and stone. Wharves stretched into the harbor. Ships of various nations rode at anchor in the bay, and all things gave early promise of a thriving and powerful city. The little cluster of buildings which had hitherto closely nestled for safety between the three hills—which were then crowned with forts and batteries of cannon, “like overtopping

towers" keeping watch and ward over the feeble colony beneath them—was spreading over the plains, and winding out through the valleys, and climbing up the heights.

It was only seventeen years since the First Church had been founded. Yet within that time its original house, with thatched roof and walls of mud,—“which had enclosed some of the noblest and choicest spirits that ever bore the Christian name;” in which Winthrop and Dudley had worshipped, the venerable Wilson taught, and the eloquent Cotton preached,—had made room for a more spacious and comfortable edifice. And now *that* also was insufficient. The town had grown so populous that still another was required. The northern part especially felt the need of such accommodation. Its inhabitants were fast multiplying; and amongst them were numbered some of the most respectable and wealthy. In those days, to feel such a want was to have it supplied.

The object dearest to the hearts of our fathers was the house of God. This was the centre, not only of their affections, but of their settlements. To rear it was their first care, their united zeal. Around it their houses were builded. Close to it they fixed their habitations,—guarding it whilst it defended them; encircling it whilst it sheltered them; providing for it whilst it blessed, and praying for it whilst it hallowed them. It was a holy and beautiful sentiment, it is amongst the most precious tokens of their piety, that they consulted with such reverential care for the sanctuary and worship of God. It marks the grand principle which prompted their enterprise, which guided and governed their movements, which lay at the founda-

tion of their institutions, and which communicated to their arduous undertaking an unconquerable impulse, an irresistible energy. It is an evidence of that spirit of religious devotedness to which we are indebted, more than to all things else, for the highest glories which have adorned our country, and the choicest blessings which have enriched our inheritance.

For such reasons, and under the influence of such sentiments, the foundation of the Second Church-edifice in Boston was laid, in 1649, at the head of North Square. We are told, to the credit of the minister of the First Church, Mr. Cotton, that with laudable liberality and self-denial he favored and encouraged the undertaking, notwithstanding it might draw away parishioners from himself. "His name," says the quaintest of New England's historians, "was John; and, like the great forerunner of Jesus who bore the same appellation, he reckoned *his* joy fulfilled in this, that in his own *decrease* the interests of his Master would *increase*." It would be pleasant to be able to find some description or picture of this our first temple. But none such has come down to us. The only notice we have of it, and which is altogether incidental, is sufficient to pique our curiosity. Our church-records give us reason to suppose, that some of the pews were accommodated with private doors through the side of the house into the street,—for what purpose, or according to what style of architecture, or in what manner constructed, we are left wholly to conjecture. No account has been discovered of its first occupancy, or its formal consecration. The first sermon preached in it, of which we have information, was

at the gathering of the church, on the fifth day of June, 1650. The original members, who were on that day united by covenant, were these seven: Michael Powell, James Ashwood, Christopher Gibson, John Phillips, George Davis, Michael Wills, and John Farnham. It is worthy of remark, that this covenant was not doctrinal, but practical; not a declaration of belief, but an obligation to Christian duty.—(See APPENDIX A.)

The preacher on that occasion was Samuel Mather,* then but a young man, yet already giving promise of the high abilities which he afterwards displayed. He was born in England; but, arriving in Boston when nine years old, finished his education in the college at Cambridge, a member of the second class that graduated at that institution. He was the first who held the office of *fellow*, then the same as tutor, at Harvard; and is said to have been so much beloved by the students that “they put on tokens of mourning in their very garments when he resigned.” The sermon alluded to called forth warm encomiums even from the grave lips of Cotton; and the new society eagerly solicited him to become their minister. He consented to remain with them for only a few months; at the expiration of which, to their great disappointment, as well as to that of several other congregations that wished his services, he returned to his native country, where he ended his days in usefulness and honor. “Afterward, Mr. Norton, minister of Ipswich, who two years after became minister of the First Church here, and Mr. Davenport, of New Haven, who

* Son of Rev. Richard Mather. See note on page 13.

seventeen years after also accepted a call from the First Church,—both of them amongst the distinguished men of that period,—and sundry others who were officers in other churches, but likely to remove from their places, were invited, with no better success, to take charge of this infant church.” *

In this dilemma, the church were content to have their worship conducted by one of their own number, the first-named of the original seven, Michael Powell. His services were so satisfactory that the church would have proceeded to ordain him as their teacher, had not the civil authority interfered. Their objection to him was that he was “illiterate as to academical education.” They would not suffer an unlearned man to be called to the teaching office “in such a place as Boston.” “He might have talents and a fine spirit,” they argued, “and still not be competent to instruct the educated, explain the Scriptures, and convince the unbelieving. If such men intrude themselves into the sacred function, there is danger of bringing the profession into contempt. If an exception should be made in the case of Mr. Powell by reason of his peculiar gifts, it might establish a dangerous precedent.” † And so jealous were the civil fathers of this country of evil consequences to the churches, that they did not permit even the ministers to control the business of ordination, lest some of them, more pious than judicious, might admit to the pulpit illiterate men by reason of their earnestness and piety. This was not a solitary instance of such interference on the part of

* Church Records.

† Mass. Hist. Collections.

the General Court in ecclesiastical affairs. Indeed, it was one of their orders, that no minister should be called into office in any of the churches within their jurisdiction, without the allowance and approbation of some of the magistrates, as well as some of the neighboring churches.

If we may judge of Mr. Powell's character by a singular paper addressed by him, by way of explanation and apology, to the "honored Governor and Magistrates," he seems at least not to have been deficient in humility, gentleness, and respect for rulers. — (See APPENDIX B.)

After having remained without a pastor for four years, it happened that Mr. John Mayo, "on account of some difficulties and discouragements," left his church at Nosset in Plymouth County: who, being both available and suitable, was invited to the pastoral office here, and ordained the ninth of November, 1655. At the same time, Mr. Powell was ordained as ruling elder of the church.*

* "The name *elders* (who are also in Scripture called bishops) includes those who attend to the ministry of the word, as pastors and teachers, and those who attend especially unto *rule*, who are therefore called ruling elders. They are not so called, however, as to exclude the former from rule and government; because these offices are common to both, though teaching and preaching are peculiar to the former.

"The ruling elder's work is to join with the pastor and teacher in those acts of spiritual rule which are distinct from the ministry of the word and sacraments. Of which sort are the following: — 1. To open and shut the doors of God's house, by the admission of members approved by the church. 2. To call the church together when there is occasion, and seasonably to dismiss them again. 3. To prepare matters in private, that in public they may be carried to an end with less trouble and more speedy despatch. 4. To moderate the carriage of all matters in the church assembled; as, to propound matters to the church; to order the season of speech and silence; and to pronounce sentence, according to the mind of Christ, with the consent of the church. 5. To be guides and leaders to the church in all matters whatsoever pertain-

Of our first pastor little is known. It is probable that he was not a distinguished man; otherwise, from his advantageous and honorable position, some notice of him would have come down to us. He had passed the prime of life when he entered upon his ministry with this church, and was perhaps beginning to lose his vigor, as well of mind as of body. It seems probable that he did not extend his labors or influence beyond the boundaries of his own parish. The only allusion, I believe, ever found to his character is contained in a single sentence, which I chanced lately to discover in the preface to a sermon by his associate, Increase Mather, of whom I shall soon speak. He says that "he was a blessing to his people; and that they two — pastor and teacher — lived together in love and peace for the space of eleven years." In 1672, it is stated in the records of our church, that Mr. Mayo grew so infirm that the congregation were not able to hear and be edified; when, with his own consent, the brethren voted to release him from the burden of supplying the pulpit. It is also written, that in 1673 he removed from Boston to Barnstable, to reside with his daughter; and there, and at Yarmouth, spent the residue of his life in quiet and retirement. He died at Yarmouth in May, 1676, and was there buried. I have been pleased to discover, amongst some very ancient receipts, several signed by Mr. Mayo's son, on behalf of his

ing to church *administrations* and *actions*. 6. To see that none in the church live inordinately, out of rank and place, without a calling, or idly in their calling. 7. To prevent and heal such offences in life or in doctrine as might corrupt the church. 8. To feed the flock of God with a word of admonition. 9. As they shall be sent for, to visit and pray over their sick brethren, — 10. And at other times, as opportunity shall serve thereunto."

aged father, after he had gone to Barnstable, which prove the fact, creditable to the church, that, though their aged pastor had ceased to serve them, they did not cease to remember his former labors, which had lasted as long as his strength, nor seize an excuse, that has often been found by religious societies, for neglecting to comfort him in his declining years. This provision was continued, as the receipts indicate, up to the time of his death. Mr. Powell also, the ruling elder, who, soon after his appointment to that office, became disabled by an attack of paralysis, and through sickness reduced to poverty, was liberally remembered in the charitable distribution of the church.

By an account of the treasurer of the church, almost illegible, it appears that he was buried the thirty-first of January, 1672-3.* It is a singular circumstance, illustrative of the funeral customs of the period, that, though the whole cost of the funeral was ten pounds and four shillings, only six shillings were paid for the grave, and six shillings for the coffin; whilst three pounds and seventeen shillings were spent for wine, and five pounds fifteen shillings for gloves.†

* As by the "Old Style" the year began in March, there is often a confusion of dates before the year 1752, when the "New Style" was adopted; in some cases a doubt arising whether January, February, and a part of March, closed the old year or began the new. This caused the practice of *double-dating*, which we often see, — for example, January, 1649-50. After the 25th of March, the Old and New Styles agree as to the year. If the event dated occurred before the twenty-fifth of March in any year, it is best to give the date as if the year began in January.

† While the pastor, teacher, and ruling elder, were in active service, they were paid according to the proportion indicated in the subjoined vote: —

"21st day of the 6th mo., 1662.

"The Church of the North End of Boston met at Bro. Collicott's, and

We have now reached a period from which dates a new and bright era in the affairs of this church, — at which I might say its history virtually commences. For before that time it had only a name to live. No records had been kept; no quickening impulse had been given to it; no vigorous growth had begun. I refer to the year 1664, in which, on the twenty-seventh of May, Increase Mather was ordained teacher; a man whose name is not only identified with the early civil and ecclesiastical annals of New England, but with the history of this church for sixty-two years, or nearly one-third of the whole period of our present survey. His character has been several times sketched, and was very justly delineated by Mr. Ware. But it has been more than once misrepresented; and, I grieve to say, by some in our own day, whose accustomed integrity and fairness only render their severe judgment in this instance more remarkable and more injurious. Indeed, such confidence had I been taught to repose in the accuracy and justice of their historical views and statements, that I had myself prejudged the case against this venerable predecessor, and supposed the judgment to be fully authorized, before I had occasion to search more carefully, as I

there did agree that Mr. Mayo should have, out of what is given to the church annually, sixty-five pounds; and Mr. Mather fifty pounds, and Mr. Powell twenty-five pounds; and this annually, provided they that have engaged perform their engagement. And, of the *Contribution*, Mr. Mayo to have twenty shillings weekly, and Mr. Mather twenty, and Mr. Powell fifteen shillings weekly, — provided the contribution hold out; and, if it abate, each one of the above-said to abate according to proportion; and if the contribution superabound, then the overplus to be kept in the ——— hands till occasion call for it, and then to be disposed of by the church's order. And to this we are all agreed."

have recently done, the authorities in the case for myself. From this research, I have come away profoundly impressed with the worth and piety of this "patriarch of New England," and irresistibly moved to do, as well as I may be able, the duty that devolves upon me, in this place and on this occasion, of vindicating his memory from unjust aspersions, and holding up for your respect and love a true image of his virtues.

The stock from which he descended was of the best; for his ancestors were righteous and godly. Better than kingly blood flowed in his veins; for it came through pure hearts and virtuous lives. His father was the Rev. Richard Mather, the faithful and valuable minister of Dorchester, in this State, one of the noble company of those who were ejected from the English Church for nonconformity to ceremonies against which their consciences revolted. Driven from his sacred charge, which he was faithfully fulfilling in England, and obliged to fly in disguise from his persecutors, he had joined the goodly band of confessors and pilgrims who "sought a faith's pure shrine" on these western shores. Surely, my friends, no Christian minister would ask a nobler lineage than that which is emblazoned with the brightest of all ensigns, the memorials of sacrifices and triumphs for conscience and the truth!*

* Richard Mather was born A.D. 1596, in Lowton, Lancaster County. His parents were of ancient families, though poor. In early life, his zeal for learning, for which the family in general were so remarkable, was so great that he used to walk four miles to school. The extreme severity of the master, however, almost quenched the young pupil's enthusiasm. Though he was a bright and diligent boy, the teacher used to "beat him eight times a-day, whether in fault or not;" so that he begged his father to take him

That such was the feeling of Richard Mather's own children, and that they were early moved to emulate their father's virtues, may be gathered from the fact that four of his sons devoted themselves to the ministry. The youngest of these was our Increase, who was born in Dorchester, the twenty-first of June, 1639.

from study, and dispose of him to some other calling. But his father was inexorable; and the son afterwards praises him for refusing his request, but adds, with great feeling, "But oh that all schoolmasters would learn wisdom, moderation, and equity towards their scholars, and seek rather to win the hearts of children, by righteous, loving, and courteous usage, than to alienate their minds by partiality and undue severity, *which had been my utter undoing*, had not the good providence of God, and the wisdom and authority of my father, prevented. He began to preach in 1618: married Katharine Hoult, daughter of Edmund Hoult, Esq. of Bury, in Lancashire, — "a godly and prudent maid," — Sept. 29, 1624. By her he had six sons: four born in England, namely, Samuel, Timothy, Nathaniel, Joseph; and two in New England, Eleazer and Increase.

The reasons which induced him to leave England, as drawn up by himself, show not only the conscientiousness of the man, but are a striking evidence also of the true motives which influenced those who first came over to this country. They are all of a religious nature. He sailed from Bristol, May 23, 1635. His interesting and curious journal of this voyage has been published, together with his "Life and Death," by the Dorchester Historical Society. He arrived in Boston, Aug. 17, 1635. The church at Dorchester ("the first church planted there having removed to Warham, Connecticut") was constituted Aug. 23, 1636; and Mr. Mather was chosen teacher, and continued in charge of the church thirty-four years. He was a studious, devout, and faithful minister, of solid judgment and stern integrity. He was "much improved" in the management of controversies, then warmly agitated, concerning church-government; author of several important works on this point; and one of three appointed by the synod at Cambridge, in 1647, to draw up the "Platform of Discipline." There were few councils or ordinations in which he had not a part. With Eliot and Welde, he was selected to make a new metrical translation of the Psalms, — the "New England Version," printed at Cambridge, in 1640, — which continued in general use by the churches for many years, and was by several eminent congregations in England preferred to all others. After the death of his first wife, he married the widow of the Rev. John Cotton, of Boston. He

His singular Christian name is said to have been given to him in gratitude to God for the providential increase and prosperity of the colony at that early date.† If so, it might seem to be not only commemorative, but prophetic; for probably no person in any country was ever able to look back upon such a wonderful and rapid career of national advancement as excited his thanks, when, in his old age, he reviewed what he had seen of New England's growth; which, as much perhaps as any other man, he had labored and helped to promote.

But the source of his virtuous inclination is not to be traced only on the father's side. Happily for him, the spring was as pure on the mother's. We hear nothing, indeed, of her consent and assistance to the self-sacrifice which brought their family from English comfort to New England hardship. But we never doubt, when we read with reverence the story of the Puritan fathers, that the Puritan mothers also went side by side with their husbands in every impulse of Christian emotion, and every movement

died April 22, 1669, aged seventy-three years. The following is his epitaph, in Dorchester Burying Ground:—

Dom Sacer
Richardus Ille Dormit Matherus
(Sed nec Totus nec Mora Diuturna)
Lætatus Genuisse Pares
Incertum est utrum Doctior an Melior
Animum & Gloria non Queunt Humari
Divinely Rich & Learned Richard Mather
Sons like Him Prophets Great Rejoiced this Father
Short Time His Sleeping Dust heres couerd down
Not His Ascended Spirit or Rinown.

U. D. M. In Aug. In Dore: N A 34 An
Obt. Apr. 22 1669 Aet suae 73

† "If he might have had an Hebrew instead of an English name, I suppose it must have been *Joseph*, which is of the like significancy." — *Cotton Mather*.

of holy duty; that, in the privacy of their homes, they helped to nerve them for their sternest struggles of conscience; and when the brave act of faith was done, and the fearful recompence of their integrity dealt to their husbands, that they richly rewarded them with their cordial sympathy, and sweetly soothed them with their gentle love.

That such praise attaches to the mother of Mather, the characters of her children are a sufficient proof. One or two of her favorite maxims are a striking index to her spirit. By means of them, we can easily picture to ourselves what sort of a woman she was, and construct her character. "My child," she often said to the young Increase, "if God make thee a good scholar and a good Christian, thou wilt have all thy mother ever asked for thee." Her daily proverb was, "Seest thou a man diligent in business, he shall stand before kings: he shall not stand before mean men." And her last saying, amid the solemnity of death, was the sublime and kindling promise of the Scriptures: "'They that be wise,' my son, 'shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars for ever and ever.'" Are not these materials enough for her moral portraiture? Diligence, love of sound learning coupled with Christian goodness, and high aspiration after heavenly glory,—with these grand features before him, who could not fill up the outlines? And these very traits,—it is worthy of remembrance as another amongst innumerable proofs of the power and endurance of maternal counsel when impressed by maternal character,—and it ought to be spoken of to her honor, for she who

nurtures a faithful man deserves honorable mention whenever his virtues are recounted, — these very traits are amongst the most prominent characteristics of her son.*

It is a sufficient evidence of his diligence, as well as his capacity, that he entered Harvard College at the early age of twelve years. After he had lived a year at the college, his parents, fearing that some things there might not suit his constitution, which they supposed to be feeble, and wishing to have him under a more than ordinary inspection and instruction, sent him to live with the famous Mr. Norton, of Ipswich, with whom he removed to Boston in 1653, and under whose tuition he continued several years.

Whilst a pupil with Mr. Norton, his conversion took place. Of this event he has given a "Relation" in his own words. The immediate cause of it was a dangerous illness, which brought him near to death, and caused him to see his sins with great vividness, and feel them with intense grief. On his recovery, he resolved to put away every sin, and seek his peace with God by prayer and fasting and an entire dedication of himself to holiness. To this "Relation" he attached the greatest sacredness; and, seventy years after it was written, caused his grandsons to transcribe it, and made the remembrance and perusal of

* The brief notice of this lady, in the "Life and Death of Richard Mather," confirms our idea of her worth: "That which of outward afflictions did most aggrieve him was the death of his dear wife, who had been for so many years the greatest outward comfort and blessing which he did enjoy; which affliction was the more grievous, in that she, being a woman of singular prudence for the management of affairs, had taken off from her husband all secular cares, so that he wholly devoted himself to his study and to sacred employments."

it a cordial to him in his lingering passage through the valley of the shadow of death. This document well represents the religious earnestness of the early New England Christians. It shows how close and searching was the preaching, how high the standard of piety, with what minuteness and exactness the marks of a true conversion were laid down and scrutinized, and how rigidly the tests of it were applied. After describing the occasion of his "first saving awakenings," and the powerful convictions of sin which oppressed him, he pictures in strong language the struggles and pangs of the new birth, the process of which was long and painful: "I pleaded hard with God that promise which says that he will take away the heart of stone, and give an heart of flesh. But still I thought my heart was as hard as a stone. . . . Sometimes I was afraid I was guilty of *the unpardonable sin*. Then, that my sins were too great to be pardoned. Then, of God's unwillingness to pardon me. . . . I was foolishly ashamed to acquaint anybody with my troubles; till at last, not being able to hold out any longer, the hand of God pressing me so sore, I acquainted my father with some of my distresses, and begged him to pray for me.

"I resolved upon setting apart another day, to be spent in secret prayer with fasting before the Lord; and the Lord made it an happy day to me, — a day I shall never forget while I have any being. On the day of our Anniversary Election, the greatest anniversary solemnity in the country, the scholars which boarded at Mr. Norton's being all abroad on their diversions, I took this opportunity of a private chamber, and, shutting the door, spent the whole day

in pouring out my complaints unto the Lord. Towards the close of the day, being full of extremity of anguish in my soul because of my sin, it was put into my heart, that I must go and throw myself down at the feet of my Saviour, and see whether he would accept me or no;—resolving that if he would accept me, then I would be his; but if not, then I would perish at his feet. So I came before him with those words of Esther, “If I perish, I perish.” Yet, Lord! if it must be so, I am resolved to perish at the feet of thy mercy. I am indeed unworthy of so much as a crumb; I have been a great sinner; yet I am resolved I will not offend any more, but be thine, and be thine only, and be thine for ever.’ And while I was thus praying and pleading, these words of Christ were darted into my mind, ‘Him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out.’ After that, I had some comfortable persuasion that my sins were pardoned.

“But, by and by, Mr. Norton showed that a man might forsake his sins, and have been in some sorrow of heart for them, and yet not be truly converted unto God. This word stuck deep in me; and I was afraid my conversion might not be sound.”

Then his father, preaching on true conversion, made the rule cover his case, and answered his scruples; and, when Mr. Mitchell preached on the “Marks of Sincerity,” he found that his heart “went along with the word.” “So,” he concludes, “I went on cheerfully in the ways of God; and, if in any thing I have been overtaken with a fault, the Lord has given me to see it, and mourn for it, and turn from it.”

Having graduated in 1656, he commenced preaching the next year, when not yet nineteen years old. But, being desirous of going abroad, and having two of his brothers* at this time settled ministers in Europe, he sailed from Boston for England in July, 1657. After spending a year at Trinity College, Dublin, where he took his second degree in 1658, and after preaching with much effect to several congregations, he was at length, like his father, compelled to conform, or leave the island. Refusing very liberal offers made to him, if he would but wear the surplice and read the Common Prayer, he again turned his face towards New England, to seek a harder but freer field of service in his native land. On a Saturday evening in September, 1661, to the surprise of all at home, he reached his father's house in Dorchester, while the old man was, even then, greeting another son,† who had just arrived from his place of ministry in North Hampton. The next day, both appeared in their father's pulpit, on either side of him; "and the comforted old patriarch sat shining between them, like the sun in gemini, hearing them entertain the people of God with performances that made all people proclaim him *a happy father*."‡

During the first winter after his return, he preached on alternate Sundays with his father at Dorchester, and to the Second Church. Invitations now flocked to him. No less than twelve parishes desired his services. But the call of this church ultimately prevailed. A manuscript in his handwriting gives a distinct account of the reasons and

* Samuel and Nathaniel.

† Eleazer.

‡ Cotton Mather.

conditions of its acceptance :—“ Within a week after my arrival in Boston, I was desired to preach to this congregation ; which accordingly I did, Sept. 8, 1661, when I preached my first sermon in Boston. The day after, the pastor and brethren invited me to labor constantly among them. After I had been with them half a year, they desired I would accept of the teaching office ; which motion I withstood for the space of two years longer, partly out of an awful sense of the dreadfulness of the bond of office-relations, partly out of a desire, which was in my heart, to return to England, had the Lord seen it good. But then the brethren all met together, and spent a day in fasting and prayer ; the main ground of which day was to entreat the Lord to bow my heart to accept of their call ; and, after this day (a passage which I think worthy to be recorded), my heart was strangely overcome to close with the desires of the church touching office-relation. The officers which were then here, and every one of the brethren, did under their hands signify their continued desires of my being so related to them. Also, the inhabitants in this end of the town did the like. Whereupon, I did return an affirmative answer to their call ; only under my hand I expressed, that, if hereafter the Lord should call me to greater service elsewhere, or in case of personal persecutions wherein not they but I shall be aimed at, or of want of health, or if I should find that a competent maintenance for me and mine should not be afforded, then (my relation to them notwithstanding) I would be at liberty to return to England, or to remove elsewhere.

“ These proposals were consented to by the church ;

whereupon I was ordained teacher of this Second Church in Boston, the 27th day of the 3d mo., 1664; my father and Mr. Mayo imposing hands upon me."

From the period of Mather's ordination till the removal of Mr. Mayo, some eight or ten years, the two officiated by turns; one as pastor, and the other as teacher. These two offices, though distinct in name, were hardly different in duties.* The work of the ministry was esteemed in those days more arduous and solemn than it generally is in our own; and, even though the congregation was not large, two incumbents were frequently employed in it to divide and relieve the labor. So long as Mr. Mayo retained his office of pastor, Mr. Mather seems to have left to him the charge of all but the pulpit-duties. But no sooner is he left alone than we begin to see a remarkable change in both the internal and external affairs of the church. He takes hold of the work with all his characteristic conscientiousness and strength. And, under God, this high purpose of his, carried into effect with powerful ability, became the lever that lifted this church to its subsequent distinction and prosperity. The expression of this purpose is his first entry on our records. "It must needs be acknowledged," he says, "that there hath been a great defect as to the

* In the "Platform of Church Discipline," 1648, the distinction between the offices of pastor and teacher is thus stated:—"The office of pastor and teacher appears to be distinct. The *pastor's* special work is to attend to *exhortation*, and therein administer a word of *wisdom*. The *teacher* is to attend to *doctrine*, and therein to administer a word of *knowledge*. Either of them to administer the seals, as also to execute the censures; being but a kind of application of the word, the preaching of which, together with the application thereof, they are alike charged withal."

administration of government of this church. The neglect whereof for so long a time hath caused things to be so far out of order, that I find it difficult, yea, impossible, to reduce matters to that state which is desirable. Nevertheless, Providence having so ordered that the sole inspection of the affairs of the Lord's house here is committed into my weak hands, I account it my duty to do the best I can that things may be set and kept in that due order which will be for the present benefit of the church, and future comfort of him, or those—if any such there be, as I trust there may—whom the Lord hath appointed to succeed me.”

From henceforth the church continued to grow and prosper, notwithstanding the burning of their house, Nov. 27, 1676, during an extensive fire, which consumed forty-five dwelling-houses and several warehouses. Of the coming of this calamity he is said to have had a powerful presentiment, leading him on the two previous sabbaths to warn his people from the pulpit, and in his study to cry earnestly to God, and even to urge his family to change their dwelling, which was afterwards burned.* Many such prophetic

* “In the year 1676, he had a strange impression on his mind, that caused him, on Nov. 19, to preach a sermon on these words, Zeph. iii. 7: ‘I said, Surely thou wilt fear me, thou wilt receive instruction; so their dwelling should not be cut off.’ This sermon he concluded with predicting that a fire was coming which would make a deplorable desolation. After he came home, he walked his study, exceedingly moved and melted, in such a soliloquy,—‘O Lord God! I have told this people that thou art about to cut off their dwellings; but they will not believe. Nevertheless, O Lord! I beseech thee to spare them. If it may stand with thy holy pleasure, spare them! spare them!’ At the same time, he earnestly urged upon his consort a speedy change of habitation. On the next Lord’s day, he preached what seemed afterwards a farewell sermon on these words, ‘Remember how thou hast received and heard.’ The conclusion was, that predictions of

impressions are attributed to him, in which he seems to have put confidence. Concerning these I have no remark to make in any cavilling spirit. That *no* premonitions are ever given from the spirit of God to the spirit of man, I should be unwilling to take it upon myself to assert. But the proof of the divine origin of the impression, in any particular case, it would be very difficult to find. It is not to be found in the *strength* of the impression; because the strongest have not been always verified. It is not to be found in the *fulfilment*; because many that have seemed equally powerful have resulted in disappointment. The remarks of Cotton Mather himself upon such prophetic impressions show a discrimination and sober judgment, such as many would hardly believe him capable of applying to such a theme:—"There might be danger lest some inconsiderate Christians, when they read of these things, might be led into an indiscreet affectation of *extraordinaries* and *singularities* in the course of their devotions. This is a thing

evil ought to be remembered; and that, when the Lord Jesus is about to bring any heavy judgment upon his people, he is wont to stir up the heart of some servant of his to give warning of it; which warning should be remembered. The last words of this sermon were: 'People won't remember nor mind these things. But as Jehu said unto his captain, "Remember how the Lord laid this burden;" so, when the evil is come, you will remember what you heard concerning it.' The very night following, a desolating fire broke out in his neighborhood. The house in which he and his flock had praised God was 'burnt with fire.' Whole streets were laid in ashes. His own house took a part in the ruins. But, by the gracious providence of God, he lost little of his beloved library,—not a hundred books from above a thousand; of those also he had an immediate recruit, by a generous offer which the Honorable Mrs. Bridget Hoar made him, to take what he pleased from the library of her deceased husband. In less than two years, also, he became owner of a better house." — *Cotton Mather's Remarkables.*

that might have perilous consequences. If I may be thought worthy to offer my advice, I would humbly say: Christians, reproach not a particular faith, as if there *never were* a gracious work of Heaven in it. But yet be cautioned against laying too much stress upon it, lest you find yourselves incautiously plunged into a hope that will make ashamed. A particular faith *may be a work of God; but the counterfeits of this jewel are so very fine that it will require a judgment almost more than human to discern them.* It is best not to be too fond of enthusiasms. It is best that you should be content with the ordinary satisfaction of praying, and so waiting for the blessings of God in such pious resignations to his will, and annihilations of your own, as an uncertainty about issues would most properly lead you to."

The fact seems to be, that Increase Mather, like many religious men of his times, was accustomed to watch narrowly the processes of thought and emotion in his own breast. And this habit of introspection, combined with a temperament somewhat gloomy, and made more so by much seclusion and study, influenced, moreover, by theological views of a depressing tendency to one so sensitively conscientious, might easily lead him to exaggerate the importance of his casual impressions, and especially to think much of his dark forebodings. We find him, accordingly, often uttering warnings to his people. It is indeed, I think, one of the faults of his sermons, that they take too dark views of Providence, and address too frequently the fears of men. They may not be more denunciatory than the sins of men deserve; but they are much more so than is consistent

with the highest effect of the denunciations themselves. Men become inured to threats and woes through their repetition. And he who is ever painting from the pulpit the sins and dangers of the people has no reason to wonder, if his hearers at length become so accustomed to his dark and terrific pictures that they fail to excite their apprehensions, as well as to stimulate their virtues.

I would not, however, have it to be inferred from these remarks, that Mr. Mather was so habituated to this style of preaching as to interfere greatly with his popularity or his success, or that strains of a more encouraging and hopeful and affectionate tone never relieved his sermons. On the contrary, they come in from time to time, sweetly and powerfully, to vary and enliven his grave admonitions and solemn warnings. Though no man was bolder or sterner to rebuke what he believed to be wrong in individuals or the nation, yet he had essentially a kind heart, and his lips were not strangers to the gentle breathings of a pastor's affection, and the softer accents of a good man's sympathy.

His appearance in the pulpit is described as having been peculiarly apostolical. His voice was strong and commanding; and he sometimes used it with great effect, delivering sentences which he wished to make peculiarly impressive "with such a *tonitruous* cogency," says his son, "that the hearers were struck with awe like that produced by the fall of thunderbolts." He was universally regarded as one of the leading preachers of his day, and by many as at the head of his profession. He spoke generally with a grave and wise deliberation. It was his endeavor to be always understood; and, though he made pulpit-oratory a

study, yet he sought to conceal every other rhetorical art, that he might practise that one art of being intelligible. With Luther, he counted him the best preacher "who taught with the highest simplicity;" and he often used the saying, "A simple diet is the most wholesome diet." It was his custom to "back every thing he said with some strong or agreeable sentence from the Scriptures; judging that, as the word of God is the food of souls, the more of it there is pertinently produced, the better fed is the flock; and, moreover, that there is in the word of God that 'voice of the Lord that is powerful and full of majesty,' and in the language also of the Sacred Scriptures an unequalled beauty." *

Though every sermon was written with great care, as if it were to be printed, it was his invariable custom to preach without reference to his notes, in order that his manner might be more free and earnest. In committing his sermons to memory, however, he would write off, on a detached sheet, the texts he wished to quote, and place it in the beginning of his Bible, to be referred to in case he should be at a loss. He had never occasion, however, to have recourse to this paper, save once, in his old age; and then he was so impressed by the strange circumstance, that he immediately wrote a remark concerning it, as a symptom of decay, which told him that his departure was at hand.

His discourses were eminently practical and direct, abounding in historical illustrations, sometimes quaint,

* "Life of Increase Mather," by his Son.

sometimes highly eloquent. They show much learning and thought; but, more than all, a sincere and ardent piety. One might be tempted occasionally to smile at marks of credulity, and instances of what to our modern taste seems grotesque in a sermon; but a feeling deeper than that smile expresses would be the total effect of a careful and candid perusal of any one of his discourses,—a feeling of respect for the profound sincerity that pervades it, and the godly fear under which it was evidently written. A recent perusal of several of his sermons, together with those of other eminent men of his era, has deeply impressed me with respect for the learning and intellectual ability, as well as the piety, of the early preachers of New England. I am persuaded, that, in these respects, justice is not done to them in our day. We are apt to suppose that modern preaching has greatly improved, especially so far as regards talent, thought, and learning. But it is not so. There is more refinement perhaps, but not more originality. There is more polish, but not more power of thought. There is a better display of materials, but not so much solid stuff. The periods may be better rounded; but they are not so full. There is a vast deal of work in the best of those old sermons. The thoughts in them have long roots, and the pictures a deep historical background. The ornaments are often the richest antiques. The best lore of ages has been made tributary to their pithy sentences. We have few divines, even in this age of intelligence, who study and labor for their sermons as they did, or who have such a serious idea of the duty of their preparation.

Increase Mather's method of employing time has come

down to us; and it may well excite the wonder of those who throw off sermons in a night. Every day in the week, except Sunday, and three days both forenoon and afternoon, he spent in *studying his sermons*. On Friday, they were to be finished; and Saturday was devoted to committing them to memory.* Such was his fidelity to the pulpit. He would bring only beaten oil into the sanctuary. He would offer to the Lord only his choicest and best for sacrifice.

The smallness of his salary and the largeness of his family caused him, for many years, to suffer from poverty and debt. His services also to the colony were sometimes expensive. Yet, with this grievous burden upon him, he

* The method of study alluded to was prefaced with prayer: — “Dear Lord Jesus! thou that knowest my works! help! help! help a poor creature, I earnestly beseech thee, so to improve his time as shall be most for thy glory, the good of thy people, and the rejoicing of his own soul, in that day when I shall see thee, my Lord, and speak with thee face to face! Amen! Amen! Amen!

“My purpose, by thy help, O Lord! is to spend my time every day as followeth:—

“*First day of the week.* Besides my public labors, attend catechizing and personal instruction in my family.

“*2d.* Forenoon, read comments; study sermon. Afternoon, read authors; study sermon.

“*3d.* Forenoon, read comments; study sermon. Afternoon, endeavor to instruct *personally* some or other; read authors.

“*4th.* Forenoon, read comments; study sermon. Afternoon, read authors; sermon.

“*5th.* Forenoon, read comments; study sermon. After lecture,† endeavor to promote among the ministers what shall be of public advantage.

“*6th.* Forenoon, read comments; study sermon. Afternoon, read authors; sermon.

“*7th.* Read comments. Prepare for Sabbath, committing sermons to memory.”

† The Thursday Lecture, still in existence.

never complained of his people, nor could make up his mind to leave them for more lucrative places that opened to him. He bore all in silence; and, though with a heavy heart, still devoted himself to his holy work with unabated resolution. In his study, and to the Great Provider alone, he poured out his distresses. Again and again we find in his diary such sentiments as these: "Grieved, and almost distracted, with thoughts of my debts. I could be content to be poor, I care not how poor, so as I may be in a capacity to serve God without distraction. But to be in debt, to the dishonor of the gospel, is a wounding, killing thought to me; so grievous, that, if it be not remedied, in a little time it will bring me with sorrow to my grave. Lord, if thou wilt provide for me, I will love thee, and thank thee, and serve thee. And if thou wilt not provide for me, I will yet love thee, and bless thee, and serve thee. If thou wilt cast *me* off, I will not cast *thee* off. I deserve thou *shouldst* cast me off. But thou, Lord, never deservest ill at my hands. The will of the Lord be done!"

Yet these embarrassments never made him selfish; nor did the scantiness of his own resources prevent him the pleasure of ministering to others' necessities. A tenth part of his income he always set apart to pious uses, esteeming this proportion to be the least that a grateful man would be satisfied thus to consecrate, and supposing that the divine will, as understood and complied with by holy men of old, required no less at the hands of believers. Indeed, in his prayers, to which I have referred, he seems to have identified the wants of the poor with his own, and for their sake, as much as for himself, to have asked for an increased

supply. His parishioners, it appears, were at first either not so considerate of his poverty as they ought to have been, or not in a condition to relieve it as they might have wished. But afterwards, in answer, as this good man believed, to his prayers, "several gentlemen of good estate and better spirit" came forward with great cheerfulness to lighten his burden and gladden his heart with timely and generous gifts, so delicately bestowed as not to disturb his manly feelings, but add to the value of their offerings.* From this time forth, they never suffered him to want. His son, in the funeral sermon preached a few days after his father's death, with great heartiness testifies to the generosity of the people. "In a very public manner," he says, "I now do, and in a *more public manner*, I hope, I again shall render you thanks. The expressions of your love to my honored father were *notable*, and were *numberless*, and were such as greatly comforted him. What you expressed in the last years of his life, and especially after he became an *emerited soldier*, and singularly at his departure, is what I know not that any church has ever equalled."

Amongst the numerous acts of benevolence which adorned the life of Increase Mather, one beautiful instance of his energetic charity and public spirit finds a striking connection with a recent noble enterprise of national munificence. In the desolating and bloody Indian war, under

* "Among whom a remembrance is particularly due to Sir Thomas Temple,—as fine a gentleman as ever set foot on the American strand. Yea, they supported his family when he who once could scarce tolerably clothe himself made an handsome appearance in the court of kings for four years together, and was able to do much for the support of the needy, and even relieved *parsons* of the established church." — *Cotton Mather*.

King Philip, in 1675, in which so many towns and villages were reduced to ashes, and the fields could not be cultivated; when the ghastly image of famine threatened to follow in the track of the horrid fiend of carnage, the pastor of this church procured from his friends in Ireland a whole shipload of provisions, together with money and clothing from London, to be distributed among the distressed inhabitants of New England. Little did our prosperous citizens think, when they were storing the "Jamestown" with their bounty, that they were but repaying a debt to Ireland, so long ago contracted by their fathers. The bread cast upon the waters, and forgot,—even though centuries intervene,—how surely does it return again!

Educated in the best society, and having seen much of the world, the manners of Dr. Mather were those of a Christian gentleman, dignified and courtly; but with a shade of puritanical austerity. Uniformly serious, he could nevertheless, on proper occasions, indulge in a becoming pleasantry and freedom. The earnestness of his religious character, however, and his supreme devotion to his holy calling, gave, as life advanced, a stamp of sanctity and gravity to his deportment, which impressed all who had intercourse with him. It was a common remark of his cotemporaries, that "it was an edifying thing only to see him in the public assemblies; for his very countenance was a sermon." It might well be so, if the countenance is an index of the heart; for his diary, in his earlier life, was constantly marked with the significant memento, "Heart Serious." It was evidently one of his most sincere and constant purposes to fulfil the precept, "Keep thy heart

with all diligence,"—to keep it in a frame habitually devotional, and in an abiding sense of the presence and inspection of God.

Few men have spent so much time in prayer, or had more entire faith in its efficacy. Whatever some may think of the "absurdity of his notions concerning the manifest answers to his petitions," and however they may turn into ridicule the "heavenly afflations which he enjoyed in his devotional flights," it is not capable of denial that he made proof, as faithfully and as earnestly, of the efficacy and joy of prayer, according to his understanding of the duty, as any other godly man of his generation. If he was sometimes under a delusion as to the *result* of his devotions, he cannot be reproached for having been negligent as to the *duty*. Those who doubt the reality of the responses he supposed he had received from heaven have no room to doubt the ardor and importunity and perseverance with which he asked and sought and knocked at its holy gate. His diary is full of prayers; his *days* were full of prayers; *whole* days were often set apart for his devotions: his study was the scene of frequent converse with God, in all the various conditions of a devout spirit, from the lowest humiliation with groanings that cannot be uttered, to the highest ecstasies of gratitude and joy and adoration.

How far he was visionary and superstitious in these devout acts; how far he mistook the chimeras of a heated brain for gracious spiritual operations; how far the light and peace, the joy and assurance, the direction and forecast, which he derived from his prayers, were really from above, or how far they were "the creatures of his own

excited imagination," or "the delusive fabrics of his own vanity," — let those determine who feel disposed to subject his religious experiences to sharp criticism, or whose spirituality qualifies them to judge.

One thing is certain. If he was deceived and deluded, it was not lightly; it was not for want of self-examination, or of careful thought and sober reasoning as to the validity of his persuasion. He cannot be confounded with the ignorantly credulous or the weak-minded. He was a wise and thoughtful, as well as earnest man. No man's sneer is strong enough to make him pass for a credulous fool, in opposition to the clear testimony both of his writings and his acts. His private papers show how cautiously he scrutinized both his own heart and the grounds of his hopes and impressions as to the success of his prayers. "I put the answer of my prayers," he says, "upon the sincerity of my soul before God. O my God! if I do not sincerely desire to glorify thy name, then let me have no answer of my prayers. But if I do in sincerity desire to serve and glorify thee, then have compassion on me, and deny me not, I pray thee." At another time, he writes thus: "My heart was moved to believe that God would accept and answer my poor prayers. — First, because I *drew nigh* to him; therefore he will draw nigh to me. Secondly, because the *things* which I asked, and the *ends* why I asked them, were for the glory of God, not for my own sake. Thirdly, for the honor of his Son, Jesus Christ. Fourthly, because nothing but my sins, which I this day confess before the Lord, can hinder the answer of my prayers; but these cannot hinder, because they are done away in the

blood of Christ, who has loved me, and given himself for me (*which I know, for that I feel my heart loveth him*). Fifthly, because there never was any creature who did humbly seek unto the Lord for such blessings as this day I prayed for, that was denied by him; and surely I shall not be the first whom God will deny. Oh, blessed for ever be my dear God, in Jesus Christ, who heareth prayer!"

From an early period of his life, Mr. Mather acted a conspicuous part in the ecclesiastical and religious affairs of New England, and wielded an influence unsurpassed by any individual of his times.

On his return from Europe, at the very commencement of his ministry, he found the churches deeply engaged in a controversy respecting the *church-state of their posterity*; a controversy which, by reason of the religious basis of the country, had its political as well as ecclesiastical bearings. New England had now been settled some thirty years; and a numerous posterity had arisen, many of whom, though baptized in their infancy, and though persons of good character, did not regard themselves, and were not regarded by the churches, as suitable for admission to the church, because they could not "come up to that experimental account of their regeneration" which the churches required for access to the Lord's table. Now, these persons could not, according to the rule of the churches, have their children baptized; and yet it seemed to our fathers that *some distinction* ought to be made in their favor, over those who had manifested no signs of a religious disposition or promise of a religious character, and those who were positively worldly and immoral. If the

children of the former should be refused baptism, they might grow up without any connection with the church, and be in danger of being lost to the kingdom of heaven. And yet, if the church should receive into membership persons who were not really regenerated, it was feared that the door would be opened for worldliness, and a laxity of religious life, full of peril to the interests of Christ. This difficulty, which was first brought into public notice in Connecticut, excited a degree of interest among the New England churches, which can hardly be conceived of at the present day, and resulted in a controversy which was agitated with no little warmth. The ministers discussed the subject in Boston in 1657, and came to a decision of the questions involved in it; and, in 1662, a synod of the churches, called by direction of the General Court, was held in the same place, more fully to consider and determine the matter. The result was a series of propositions, embodying the principle of what was afterwards called "*the half-way covenant*." According to this, persons of sober life not experimentally regenerated, though not allowed to join the church, were permitted to have their children baptized, if they would own the covenant made by their parents on their behalf in their infancy.*

This result of the synod was regarded with jealousy by several eminent divines, who feared that "the sacred

* The first instance of any one being received into the Second Church by the half-way covenant appears to have been Jan. 15, 1693. The following is the record: "Received into covenant, Mary Sunderland; and her son John baptized, — they being the first so admitted in pursuance of the church's addresses unto me for that purpose and practice." The half-way covenant has not been used in this church since April, 1786.

ordinance of baptism should come to be applied to such unmeet subjects as would in a while put an end to New England's primitive and peculiar glory of undefiled administration." One of these was the President of the College, Charles Chauncy, who published a treatise, entitled "*Antisynodalia Americana*." Increase Mather took the same ground, and also published his dissent and the reasons of it. But afterwards, having been convinced that he was in the wrong, partly by his father, who wrote on the opposite side, partly by the sound arguments of the "matchless Mr. Mitchell," and partly by his own longer experience and reflections, he not only changed his opinion, but published two able treatises in defence of the synodical propositions.

This change and recantation have been regarded by some as indicative of weakness and inconsistency, and even as having originated in a desire to court popularity, by falling in with the general current, which he found to be setting against his earlier views. But I see no reason for attributing to him either inconsistency or policy. It is a mark of manliness and love of truth to give up opinions, however once firmly and conscientiously held, when one has become convinced of their unsoundness; and an open avowal of such a change, with the reasons that have led to it, seems to be, on the part of a public man and a minister whose previous views have gone abroad through the press, hardly less an obligation than an honor. He may lay himself open thereby to the cavils of the censorious and the inimical; but the purer feeling of candid men will appreciate his painful sacrifice of pride to truth, and shrink from attributing to selfish and sinister motives what the avowed

reasons are adequate to justify, and a more enlightened understanding would be sufficient to account for. The saying of Dr. Owen, as quoted by Cotton Mather, is not inapplicable to the case in hand: "He that can glory that in fourteen years he hath not altered nor improved his conceptions of some important things, shall not have me for his rival."

Through the influence of Increase Mather more than of any others, the General Court were induced, in 1679, to convoke a general synod of all the churches, called afterwards the "Reforming Synod," to consider and report upon the following questions: "1. What are the evils that have provoked the Lord to bring his judgments upon New England? 2. What is to be done that so these evils may be reformed?" The "judgments" particularly referred to were King Philip's war; the smallpox, which had recently made fearful ravages, and filled the people with consternation; the great fire of 1676, and the still greater of Aug. 8, 1679, — calamities which had almost simultaneously afflicted the colony. These sore distresses were looked upon by our fathers as awful visitations of Divine Providence, on account of the transgressions of the people. The godly spirits of the pastors were grieved at the decay of that piety which had been so illustrious in the pilgrims. They saw with alarm the general falling away from the strict notions and habits of the first settlers; "they bewailed, in most pathetic strains," the degeneracy of the age. And, as they felt that the punishment of Heaven was justly merited, so they supposed that at length, in these grievous afflictions, the recompense had begun.

Having first kept a general fast, the synod met at Boston, Sept. 10, 1679. Mr. Mather preached during its session, was the principal mover in all its deliberations and doings, and drew up the result, which was unanimously adopted. On its presentation by a committee of ministers to the General Court, Mr. Mather preached again; after which, that body accepted the result, and commended it to "the serious consideration of all the churches and people in the jurisdiction."

The catalogue of sins specified in this document would strike with surprise many modern readers, who are accustomed to believe that the men of that age were generally remarkable for sober habits and piety. It is not improbable that the picture was too darkly colored by the stern and somewhat gloomy prophets who drew it. Yet, evidently, there was substantial reason in the moral condition of the people for the concern and reproof of a faithful ministry, and for earnest endeavors after reform. The principal measures proposed by the synod to this end were,—that the work of reformation should begin with the magistrates; that the churches should be more strict and faithful in their discipline; that earnest efforts should be made to provide a devoted ministry; that wholesome laws should be established and executed, and schools of learning encouraged.

This celebrated Reforming Synod held a second session the next year, when Increase Mather was appointed Moderator; and the "New England Confession of Faith" was adopted, which, in the doctrinal parts, mainly agrees with the "Westminster Confession." The sickness of the Moderator—the beginning, as it proved, of a dangerous fever—

did not prevent the discharge of his duties, but was forgotten for a time in the intensity of his interest in the business to be done, which was despatched with unexampled rapidity through his promptness and close application.

In the controversy concerning the "*qualifications for admission to the church*," Dr. Mather felt a deep interest, and took an active part. The attempt to alter the old order of the New England churches, towards the close of the seventeenth century, by dispensing with "a relation of religious experience," on the part of candidates for church-membership, was contrary to his fixed opinions and earnest convictions. He wrote against it, and opposed it with all his might, as a dangerous innovation. He insisted that "doctrinal knowledge and outward blamelessness are not sufficient qualifications for admission to the church; but that *practical confessions*, or some relation of the work of conversion, are necessary. Churches are bound to inquire into the *spiritual estate* of those whom they receive to full communion." One of those with whom he engaged in controversy on this subject was Rev. Mr. Stoddard, of Northampton. It is somewhat singular, that the great champion of orthodoxy, President Edwards, — who, many years after, resisted the views of Stoddard, taking the same ground with Increase Mather, and supporting it as earnestly; and through whose influence mainly the orthodox congregational churches of New England retained the ancient practice alluded to above, — was both the successor and grandson of Stoddard. And it is a fact worthy of notice, that "those churches which adopted the views of Edwards, together with those which have

since sprung out of them, constitute in general the orthodox churches of the present day; while those which persisted in the views of Stoddard became, with few exceptions, first Arminian, and then Unitarian.”*

Another controversy, closely allied to that just noticed, was agitated at about the same period; in which Mr. Mather was no less interested. It related to the choice of ministers; the question being, whether the *church* should choose independently of the *congregation*, and have precedence in the matter, or vote only in connection with the latter. Mr. Mather, with his strong attachment to the old order, advocated the claim of the church;† it being, as he

* Professor Pond; whose biographical sketch of Increase Mather is written with ability, though evidently with a strong sectarian bias. His views of the character of Mather appear to me to be in general just, and to be sustained by competent authorities, though to these Mr. Pond has very rarely referred. He has failed, probably through inadvertence, to make due acknowledgment of his obligations to Cotton Mather’s “Remarkables,” considering that he has not only relied upon that old book for facts, but has constantly incorporated sentences and paragraphs from it into his work, with no change, or but a trifling one, in the language. He has added, however, valuable historical and other matter, showing research and general information.

† It is not to be questioned, that, amongst the earliest churches in New England, the *church* had control in ecclesiastical matters. A very few exceptions, which have been found in the records of two or three churches after 1672, only prove the rule. The principle was perhaps sometimes questioned; but the primitive usage was next to universal. Indeed, it must have been so from the very constitution of the *state*; since before 1662 the civil disabilities affixed to non-church-membership were not altogether done away; and if none but church-members had a right to vote in *civil* matters, much less in ecclesiastical.

The first notice in the church at Plymouth of church and town joining in giving a call to a minister is on occasion of Mr. Little’s settlement, 1699. “None, it seems, in that day pleaded for the society’s right of supplying the pulpit, without the church’s leading in the affair. And in more ancient

thought, abundantly sustained both by usage, and by a regard to the best interests of religion itself; since professed and approved Christians would be most likely to be guided in their choice by religious considerations, and to consult for the true spiritual welfare of the flock. Our records show that in August, 1697, "a letter of admonition was voted by the Second Church to the church in Charlestown, for betraying the liberties of the churches, in their late putting into the hands of the whole inhabitants the choice of a minister." No better proof than this could be given of the extent to which our pastor carried his zeal upon this subject.

But the day was now at hand when his opinions upon these important questions were to meet with more strenuous opposition from high places, and his temper and patience to be put to the severest test. A number of highly influential and respectable men associated for the purpose of founding a new church in Boston, on the very principles which Mr. Mather so warmly opposed,—the choice of minister without the distinct action of the church, and admission to full communion without a relation of expe-

days, by some hints in the church-records, it may be gathered that the church managed the whole affair both of inviting and calling, there being no mention of the congregation." See valuable Appendix at the close of "A Sermon at the Ordination of Rev. Chandler Robbins, over the First Church in Plymouth, Jan. 30, 1760," by his father, Rev. Philemon Robbins, Pastor of the First Church in Branford, Conn.

In 1672, an instance of the same kind occurred in the First Church in Salem; also at Dedham, in 1685. We discover a gradually progressive liberality of sentiment upon this, as upon other matters, in the churches generally for many years; but I have seen no sufficient proof, that the established order of the original churches was not as Increase Mather regarded it.

riences. Having built a house of worship in Brattle Square, and called Mr. Benjamin Colman, then in England, to be their minister, — a child of the Second Church, baptized and admitted by Increase Mather, and early distinguished for shining abilities and high virtues, — they published a “manifesto or declaration,” just before the dedication of their church, setting forth the purposes and principles of their undertaking. This public statement was rendered necessary by the very general opposition that prevailed among the churches to the enterprise. It called forth severe animadversion and letters of admonition from such ministers as Higginson and Noyes, of Salem, and Increase Mather; and led to a long controversy, conducted on both sides with an asperity unworthy of Christians, and for which sufficient justification cannot be found in the fashion of the times, or the ardent zeal of the disputants for the interests which they esteemed sacred. But, whatever impropriety of speech and infirmity of temper may have been exhibited, both parties are alike blameworthy. So far as I am capable of judging, there is little to choose between them. There were other causes of animosity than mere differences of opinion upon the ecclesiastical questions at issue. This will be evident to any one who has patience and inclination to search carefully the historical documents that throw light upon this matter. It is not my intention, however, to go into an exposition of the various motives and conflicting interests that were involved in this controversy, and gave to it its tone of personality and bitterness. It is painful to be compelled to allude to them at all. I would not do so, but for the sake

of even-handed justice. I cannot allow the imputation of violence and disgraceful rage in the conduct of this dispute to rest upon Increase Mather alone, or pre-eminently; whilst sufficient evidence lies before me, that others, no less amenable to censure than himself, have been permitted to escape under cover of the opprobrium cast upon him. If vehemence and asperity are to be palliated in *any* man in consideration of a consuming zeal for what he conceives to be of vital moment to the cause of religion, few persons could present a stronger claim to such indulgence than Mr. Mather. And if, moreover, mere opposition of opinion or belief, or feelings of personal antipathy, give the historian no right to shade more darkly the character he is painting, the friendly pen that honors those whose views and measures were at variance with Increase Mather's should forbear to draw the contrast between *his* temper and motives and *theirs* so broad as to make his infirmities a foil to their merits or a screen to their faults.

Mr. Mather was offered the Presidency of Harvard College in 1681; but refused the office, because his church would not consent to part with him. He had always manifested a deep interest in the affairs of that institution, and was already one of the most distinguished of its alumni. For these reasons, as well as on account of his eminent qualifications, he was again solicited by the overseers, in 1685, to take the superintendence, and act as President *pro tempore*. From this period, he remained at the head of the college for sixteen years; though presiding over it only on condition that he should retain his connection with his church and reside in Boston. He served the

college well. The records show it; the increase of students during his administration shows it; the united testimony of two historians of Harvard College makes it certain;* the more so, if from one of them it seems extorted by the pressure of obvious facts, and the decisive praise of contemporary documents. It is true, indeed, that the general tone of the account of his Presidency to which I refer is calculated to leave a most unfavorable impression; and that the allusions to Mather, the epithets applied, and the motives ascribed to him, are such as would condemn him to the aversion and contempt of every pure and honest mind, if the intelligent reader did not understand how much weight to subtract from these imputations, when offset against the unequivocal and substantial eulogy condensed into a single sentence, so out of tune with what precedes and follows, that one is almost tempted to suspect there is irony in it:—“*That Dr. Mather was well qualified for the office of President, and had conducted himself in it faithfully and laboriously, is attested by the history of the college, the language of the legislature, and the acknowledgment of his cotemporaries.*” This is a satisfactory verdict as it is. But if it were brightened in the coloring—as truth would warrant it to be—half as much as the censure surrounding it is deepened beyond the demands of justice, it would give to us such a representation of this eventful Presidency as plain facts substantiate; concurrent, co-eval testimony, both private and public, justifies; and the impartial verdict of posterity will sanction. He loved his Alma Mater, as we

* Pierce and Quincy.

love it, with all his heart. He was devoted to its interests. He gained friends and raised funds for it at home and abroad. He worked for it as laboriously as any man could have done in a similar situation. He gave to it all the time and strength that justice to other obligations would allow, or fidelity to the conditions under which he held his official relation to it could demand. He was especially sedulous in his efforts for the moral and religious improvement of the students. He not only publicly admonished them of their duties to God, but by private interviews sought to lead them to a Christian life. His discourses to them were characterized by a prophet's earnestness and a parent's love. His farewell address, which has been preserved, is a beautiful tribute to the sincerity of his piety, his conscientiousness as a preacher, and the depth and tenderness of his interest in the spiritual welfare of the young.

His only offence in the Presidency — if offence it be — was, that he set his face strongly against what he thought would do the college vital injury; against changes which he regarded as dangerous, and individuals whose theological and, it may be, political opinions he viewed with distrust. This, I believe, is the head and front of his offending. He loved the college as "the school of the prophets," and wished and prayed that it might preserve its claim to this title and character so dear to him. He foresaw a growing tendency to departure from "Christ and the church," which filled him with anxious forebodings. He perceived the working of causes which, if not checked, would inevitably wrest the college from the old Calvinistic rule, to which he was conscientiously and rigidly attached,

and place it under influences which he supposed unfavorable to evangelical faith and piety.

And for this he is not to be blamed, but rather honored, if his opinions were conscientious and his convictions sincere. At the head of his religious party; nurtured in the ancient faith of the Puritans, and one of its oldest and firmest living defenders; having deeper insight into what was going on than any other man; in the very position to speak and act; full of zeal, and richly furnished by study and reflection; his whole soul stirred within him,—who can censure him for taking the stand he did, and striving to maintain it with all his might? And if, in one or two instances, he overstepped the bounds of courtesy and moderation; if sometimes his feelings were too excited, and his speech too severe,—may not we, who sometimes need to be excused for the infirmity of our nature, judge *him* less harshly when some inherited “rash humor” for a time makes him forget himself?—(See APPENDIX C.)

But I must hasten to glance at another field of his large and various usefulness. The name of Increase Mather is as intimately connected with the political as with the ecclesiastical history of his country. His services to New England in this respect were amongst the most important that were rendered by the most able and patriotic men of the age in which he lived. His private papers show how earnestly, in secret, he prayed for the true welfare of his native land; while the records of the General Court testify, and the annals of the period bear witness, how generously and faithfully he labored for its good, whenever opportunity was offered for his exertions, or necessity re-

quired his intervention. No better proof could be desired either of the esteem in which he was held by his fellow-citizens, of the power of his influence and abilities, or of the devotedness and wisdom of his patriotic efforts, than is furnished by the history of his endeavors to retain the old charter, and his agency to England to procure a new.

Between King Charles II. and the New England colonies, particularly the Massachusetts, there had been, from the beginning of his reign, no cordial agreement. He was exorbitant in his claims; and they were backward in yielding to them. He was constantly encroaching upon their chartered rights; and they were as pertinacious in maintaining them. He aimed to restrict their lawful liberties; and they were determined not to let them go. Things could not long continue in this state, without leading to open collision and a decisive issue. Accordingly, in Oct. 1683, Edmund Randolph, one of the bitterest enemies of the colony, was sent over from the king with a message, that Massachusetts should resign its charter, or a *Quo warranto* against it should be prosecuted. The people were now in a perilous dilemma. Should they voluntarily surrender their charter, or brave the king, and let him wrest it away from them? This was the question,—a grave question truly. It was referred to Increase Mather, who demonstrated “that they would act neither the part of good Christians nor of true Englishmen, if by any act of theirs they should be accessory to the plot then managing to produce a general shipwreck of liberties.” This opinion, being circulated, excited against him the rage of the royal partisans. When the freemen of Boston met to instruct their

deputies to the General Court, he was desired to be present in the town-house, and give his advice. A copy of his short and pithy speech on that occasion was found among his papers after his decease. It is as characteristic of the age and of the man as it is creditable to him as a staunch patriot and an earnest defender of his country's liberties.* Its effect was decisive. The vote of the meeting was unanimous against submission.

"The example of Boston decided the question throughout the country; and this is one of the early instances in which the lead was taken by this town in those spirited measures of opposition to arbitrary oppression, for which the descendants of the Puritans have been always distinguished."

* "As the question is now stated, whether you will make a full submission and entire resignation of your charter and the privileges of it unto his majesty's pleasure, I verily believe we shall sin against the God of heaven if we vote an affirmative unto it. The Scripture teacheth us otherwise. We know what Jephthah said, 'That which the Lord our God has given us, shall we not possess it?' And though Naboth ran a great hazard by the refusal, yet he said, 'God forbid that I should give away the inheritance of my fathers!' Nor would it be wisdom for us to comply. We know David made a wise choice when he chose to fall into the hands of God, rather than into the hands of men. If we make a full submission and entire resignation to pleasure, we fall into the hands of men immediately. But if we do it not, we still keep ourselves in the hands of God, we trust ourselves with his providence; and who knows what God may do for us? There are also examples before our eyes, the consideration whereof should be of weight with us. Our brethren hard by us, what have they gained by being so ready to part with their liberties, but an acceleration of their miseries? And we hear from London, that when it came to [the point with them], the loyal citizens would not make a full submission and entire resignation to pleasure, lest their posterity should curse them for it. And shall we, then, do such a thing? I hope there is not one freeman in Boston that can be guilty of it. However, I have discharged my conscience in what I have thus declared unto you."

The threatened alternative followed. The charter was forfeited, and a Governor appointed with unlimited power to make what laws suited his own pleasure.* His administration was oppressive in the extreme, and hateful to the people.†

In this grievous condition, the only prospect of remedy, in the opinion of the best men of the country, seemed to be through the mission of a well-qualified person to the king, bearing the addresses of the churches,‡ and soliciting in person, at the foot of the throne, the royal clemency and protection. The man, of all others, upon whom the public

* Sir Edmund Andros.

† The weight of taxation was unreasonably augmented. The ceremonial of marriage was altered, and the celebration of that rite confined to ministers of the Church of England, of whom there was only one in the whole Province of Massachusetts. The fasts and thanksgivings appointed by the churches were suppressed by the Governor. He often took occasion to remark, and with the most offensive insolence, in presence of the Council, that the colonists would find themselves mistaken, if they supposed that the privileges of Englishmen followed them to the ends of the earth; and that the only difference between their condition and that of slaves was that they were not bought and sold. It was declared unlawful for the people to assemble in public meetings, or for any one to quit the province without a passport from the Governor. He selected, and intrigued with, jurymen, to screen his own tools from punishment; and questioned the validity of existing land-titles, requiring new grants from himself to make them perfect, for which he exacted exorbitant fees. — See Grahame's History.

‡ A notice of the action of this church in the matter of the address to the king is contained in the following vote:—

“Oct. 30, 1687, after the sermon and service of the afternoon ended, I desired the brethren of the church to stay in the meeting-house, and proposed to them, that their officers might in their name draw up an address of thanks to the king, for his declaration, wherein he does promise us the free exercise of our religion, and that he will maintain us in the enjoyment of our rights and possessions. I told the brethren I would take their silence for consent. All were silent, — *nemine contradicente*.”

attention was turned was Increase Mather. Being solicited to undertake the important duty, he laid the matter before his church, in the manner thus recorded by himself:—

“Dec. 11, 1687, I desired the brethren to stay, and acquainted them that it was thought needful that some one should be sent with an address of thanks to the king, for his gracious declaration; and that it had been proposed to me that I should go on the service. I told them that if they said to me, Go, I would cast myself on the providence of God, and go in his name; but if they said to me, Stay, I would not stir.

“Major Richards and —— Way declared their willingness and free consent that I should go. I said to the brethren, if any of them were otherwise minded, I desired they would express themselves. Also, I would take their silence for consent. They were then all silent, and so did unanimously consent.”

Every method was taken by the Government to prevent Mr. Mather's leaving the country. He was arrested by Randolph for defamation, in a suit for five hundred pounds damage; but, notwithstanding the intrigues of his adversary, was acquitted by the jury; the plaintiff being charged with the costs of court. He waited on the Governor, to acquaint him with his purposed voyage; and gave public notice, in a sermon at the “Great Lecture,” on the text, “If thy presence go not with us, carry us not up from hence.” A further attempt at arrest was made, but frustrated by a mere accident. Mr. Mather then withdrew quietly from his house, in disguise, to the mansion of Col. Phillips in Charlestown. On his way, an under-sheriff,

placed to watch his movements, recognized him, but dared not lay hands upon him. From Charlestown he was conveyed by some young men of his flock to Winnisimmet, and, in a small boat, carried down the harbor. The ship "President," in which he was expected to sail, was carefully searched before leaving the wharf, of course without success. He was taken on board in the bay, and in due time safely landed in England.

It would carry me beyond the purpose of this discourse to give a full history of Mr. Mather's agency to England; though to do so would be to set before you in strong light his distinguished practical talents. His task was an arduous and perplexing one; but, by sagacity and patience, by untiring energy, by an ever-watchful fidelity to his country's interests, combined with a remarkable power of influence, by which he was enabled to enlist in his cause, as far as any man could have done it, the co-operation of eminent men and the royal favor abroad, and at the same time public sentiment at home, he performed it at length, after four years of labor, in such a manner as to merit the thanks of his countrymen, and to command the praise of every impartial historian.* "He returned to New England,"

* "The speaker, in the name of the House of Representatives, returned him thanks for his *faithful*, painful, indefatigable endeavours to serve his country; and added that they were willing to reward them, but that, by reason of an expensive war, they were unable to do any thing proportionable to his merits. To which Mr. Mather answered, that he sought not *theirs*, but them, in all that he had endeavored; and, for his recompense, he was willing to expect it in another world." — *Cotton Mather*.

"A day of solemn thanksgiving to Almighty God was appointed for his safe arrival, together with that of the Governor, Sir William Phipps, and for their services to the country." — *Hutchinson*, vol. i. p. 416.

says Mr. Quincy, "with a well-earned consciousness that he had fulfilled, during his residence abroad, his *entire duty* to the colony." — *Hist. Harv. Col.*, vol. i. p. 78. "Whatever opinions we may be compelled to entertain concerning his measures and motives on other occasions, his conduct in this great crisis of his country entitles him to unqualified approbation. It is scarcely possible for a public agent to be placed in circumstances more trying or critical; nor could any one have exhibited more sagacity and devotedness to the true interests of his constituents. By his wisdom and firmness in acceding to the new charter, and thus assuming a responsibility of the weightiest kind, in opposition to his colleagues in the agency, he saved his country, apparently, from a rebellion or a revolution, or from having a constitution imposed by the will of the transatlantic sovereign, possibly at the point of the bayonet." — *Hist. Harv. Col.*, vol. i. p. 123.*

* It gives me great pleasure to be able to adduce the peculiarly valuable testimony of President Quincy in this connection. It is, however, a matter of wonder what solution that justly eminent man found for the problem which must suggest itself to every attentive reader of his history of the college, and can hardly have failed to occur to himself, — how it happened that a man, such as he represents Increase Mather, "restless, obtrusive, excitable, a partisan by profession, whose life had been one series of theological and political controversy, always harnessed and ready and restless for the onset; now courting the statesmen, now mingling with the multitude; exciting the clergy in the synod, and the congregation in the pulpit, and the people in the halls of popular assembly; a man of an ill-governed and overbearing spirit, violent, ambitious;" a man who is represented as the dupe of his own vanity, even in his prayers, and willing to make college, church, or creed subservient to his personal aggrandisement, — how it happened that a man of such a temper, such motives, and such a character, should have stood the severe test of the four years' agency in England so honorably as to expose no weak point, even to that most piercing discernment which has

The value in which his cotemporaries held his services, and the esteem with which they regarded his character, are strikingly shown in a letter from the principal Dissenting clergymen in England to the General Court at Boston,—a letter no less noticeable for the beauty and grace of its style than for the justice and wisdom of its sentiments. In the course of it, they say, “The truth is, your affairs were so difficult and thorny, that the rare union of the wisdom of the serpent and the innocence of the dove was requisite in managing them. . . . We must, therefore, give this true testimony of our much esteemed and beloved brother, Mr. Increase Mather, that *with inviolate integrity, excellent prudence, and unfainting diligence, he hath managed the great business committed to his trust.* As he is instructed in the school of heaven to minister in the affairs of the soul, so he is furnished with a talent to transact affairs of state. His proceedings have been with that caution and circumspection which is correspondent to the weight of his commission. He, with courage and constancy, has pursued the noble scope of his employment; and, understanding the true moment of things, has preferred the public good to the vain conceits of some, that more might have been obtained if peremptorily insisted on.”

But his services abroad were not confined to the single object for which he had been sent. He constantly preached in the pulpits of his brethren, declining all remuneration to himself, and asking only the interest of the ministers on behalf of his country. He let slip no opportunity to penetrate to his hidden motives, and brought to light every real or possible infirmity of his spirit.

advance the interests of religion in England. He gained the general esteem of the Dissenting churches, and the intimate friendship of the leading divines of all parties,—of Tillotson and Burnet, as well as of Bates and Mead and Baxter. Through his instrumentality, according to the testimony of Dr. Annesley and others, more than through that of any other man, the Union of the English Presbyterian and Congregational Churches was effected; and with his assistance the “Heads of Agreement” were drawn up. For this eminent service, and “the great pains taken therein,” he received a vote of thanks from the General Assembly of Devonshire, through their Moderator, the celebrated John Flavel.*

For the college also he strenuously labored, laying its case before the king, and commending its interests to the wealthy and munificent. If he cannot justly claim the credit, attributed to him by his son, of having, “through his acquaintance with, and proposal to, that good-spirited man and lover of all good men, Mr. Thomas Hollis, introduced his benefactions to the college,” there can be no doubt that he used what influence he had, to further the noble purpose which has made that name honored and dear to every New England scholar, and every admirer of liberality and goodness.

I cannot close this brief sketch of his foreign labors, without alluding to yet one other service to New England, too important to be forgotten. I refer to the happy union, brought about directly by his influence, between the colo-

* Cotton Mather’s Life of Increase.

nies of Plymouth and Massachusetts. He discovered that a design was on foot to unite Plymouth to New York, notwithstanding the distance between them. Nay, it had already gone so far, that, when Mr. Slaughter was appointed Governor of New York, Plymouth was actually put into his commission. It was taken out, and the commission altered, only through Mr. Mather's industry and discreet application.* A second time, the same project was attempted, and, on the very eve of its consummation, was again defeated through his renewed exertions. Let the wise and firm agency by which the two choicest colonies of the Pilgrims were so early bound together, in preparation for that noble State in which they are now blended inseparably and for ever, be cherished in grateful remembrance!

It deserves to be mentioned further, in connection with this important transaction, that Mr. Mather served the country without any remuneration. It was charged against him, in a malignant publication, that he had spent much of the public money during his negotiation. The accusation was so grossly false, that his friends, having obtained from him an exact statement of the facts in the case, prepared and published a vindication. In this it appears that he not only never demanded a farthing of recompense for the four years spent abroad, but actually procured, in donations to the province and the college, at least nine hundred pounds more than all the expenses of his agency.†

* Hutchinson, vol. i. p. 405.

† This last expression leads me to suppose, that the actual "business-expenses" of the agency, separate from the agent's private expenses and

I have thus endeavored to trace the career of Mr. Mather, and develop his character and opinions, especially in connection with the most important public transactions and controversies in which he was engaged. You have seen that from early life he was marked for eminence in church and state, and no sooner had arrived at maturity than "he was looked up to as a leader in both religious and civil affairs, equally active, distinguished, and trusted.* You have seen that he was a zealous Calvinist and a thorough-going Congregationalist; strict in doctrine, in an age of strictness; severe in morals, where morality was the

every thing in the nature of a salary, may have been, at least in part, provided for by the colony. In a statement written by him while in London in 1691, he uses this language: "Besides what was sent to me out of New England, I expended upwards of two hundred pounds of my own personal estate, out of love to that people; and I did, for their sake, borrow of a merchant in London above three hundred pounds more." Referring to a later period of his agency, he says, "For more than a twelvemonth, not one penny was received, so that I was forced either to suffer a ruin to come upon the country, or else must borrow money again to serve them; which I did, and engaged all the estate I have in the world for the repayment thereof."

* "Nature had bestowed upon him the power to be great, and he was religiously sensible of his obligations to exercise this power usefully. Born and trained in a young colony, struggling with hardships, and forcing its way through peril and fear; his mind fashioned by a father who had all the zeal and firmness which characterized the Puritans of that age, — a race eminently formed to do and to dare, — thus gifted and educated, he became peculiarly fit, and no wonder it was felt that he was fit, to have an ascendancy, and exercise a control. He had received the best education of his own country; he had completed it abroad; he had been driven from place to place, suffering for his religion, and presented with strong temptations to abandon it; thus acting a hurried and various part in the most trying times in the mother-country; and after this discipline, so calculated to give firmness and character, he returned to labor in the service of this infant state. Nothing can be conceived more likely to prepare a man to act well his part in so peculiar a scene." — *Rev. H. Ware, jun.*

sternest; and rigid in piety, where all were rigid. You have seen that he was ardent, and yet firm; enthusiastically devotional, yet eminently sagacious and practical; of quick impulses, yet persevering in purpose and patient in execution; a lover of study, yet at the same time fond of affairs; familiar with books, yet equally acquainted with men; devoted to the church, and yet ever at the service of the state. You have seen that he was bold and determined alike in attack or in defence, when any important principle was involved, or any public interest at stake. He may have sometimes appeared to you ambitious, but never out of the line of duty. He may have struck you as fond of authority, but never as subordinating principle to place. You may have inferred that he wished to rule, but never where he was not reasonably conscious of superior ability, or sincerely desirous of some result which he believed beneficial to his country or salutary to the church. You may have regretted in him a few infirmities, in common with the best of men; but you have admired in his character a variety and combination of virtues rarely surpassed or even equalled. You may have wondered at occasional manifestations of irritability and rudeness in dispute, because they break the harmony of an otherwise holy life; but they are not sufficient to destroy your conviction, that at heart he was sound in goodness, and in spirit consecrated to God.

He had his enemies, however, in his own day; some of them among the great of the land, and some full of bitterness; and they did not spare their accusations. His distinguished position exposed him to their shafts. His political

measures were offensive to some ; his theological opinions, to others. To some men, he was an obstacle in the way of their preferment ; others hated him, as having been deprived by his influence of the offices they coveted ; others remembered him as a powerful antagonist in controversy ; others envied his popularity, or feared his opposition.

But, in spite of all these, and of all that they have written, his name, till very recently, has held an honorable place in the history both of church and state. The fame which contemporary enemies could not destroy has encountered, at length, a more powerful and honored assailant, from whose condemnation it can never rise again, if it be not aided by the inherent resurgency of virtue,—if it be not vindicated through the eternal law, that merit shall overmaster the influence of the strong, and disannul the adverse judgment that seems, and is intended to be, most just.

I trust that truth is dearer to me than the reputation of one whom I venerate ; and if the truth required that the image of one of my predecessors should be taken down from the shrine which it has occupied, for more than a hundred years, in the churches' reverence, and publicly dishonored, I could bow the head in silence, though I might not sympathize with the spoiler, nor be accessory to the deed. But when I feel, as in the case of our first Mather, that the claims of truth are coincident with the claims of affection, and that the sentiment of justice conspires with the impulse of pious duty, it would be no less criminal than mean-spirited to refrain from attempting to reinstate his name in its former glory, because to do so must bring

me into conflict with the living whom I respect and honor.

Grave charges have been made against him, which I need not here repeat. But what is the ground on which they rest? what the source from which the proofs that sustain them have been gathered or inferred? Every public document of his times, in which his name is mentioned, speaks of him in terms of respect. All his public acts praise him. Repeated votes of the court and of the college bear strong testimony to the value set upon his services, and the esteem in which his character was held. The clergy honored him with undoubted marks of reverence. Single churches looked up to him for counsel, and assembled churches acknowledged his authority. In difficult crises, the magistrates consulted him; and, in perilous emergencies, the colony employed his agency and hearkened to his advice. And, to crown all, the record of his long ministry to this church is not only unstained by a single line to his discredit, but spread all over with proofs of his fidelity and power, tokens of the love which was cherished towards him by his flock, and names of the sainted or illustrious, who are the seals of his ministry, the stars of this church, the jewels of God.

Where, then, is the ground of these accusations? They are professedly supported, in great measure, upon the evidence which his private diary supplies. His public acts, interpreted by this, are traced, it is said, to their interior motives; and, again, the motives so deciphered are transferred to other public acts, of which the *ostensible* motive is suspected, while the diary furnishes no other;

and thus he is made, unintentionally, to convict himself. His sincerity in his closet becomes traitor to his caution before the world. His inadvertence behind the curtain discloses his artifice on the stage. And secret passions, which his contemporaries could only suspect, are unwittingly revealed to the searching eye of the future historian. For these ends, the sanctity of his closet has been invaded; the record of his solitary devotions, his most sacred hours, has been ransacked; the record of his *prayers*,—prayers, many of which are so tender and earnest as might touch the coldest heart; of his confessions to God,—confessions so profoundly humble that one might well shrink from prying into what was told as a secret only to Him who is more merciful than man,—this record of prayers, confessions, resolves, interior experiences, with here and there a fact or a comment upon men and things, has been shuffled over and spelled out, to supply instruments for the destruction of the writer's own fame, which public registers and all other sources had failed to furnish.

I cannot trust myself to speak, as I feel, of such dealing with the private papers of holy men. They were not written for critical eyes to examine, or irreverent observers to inspect. Such will be sure to misunderstand, and can never fairly interpret them. What is uttered concerning one's self before God, in the moment of deep contrition and humiliation, will be taken as literally as if it were the calm verdict of a judge. The expression of that sense of unworthiness which bows the pious soul in shame before the immaculate holiness of Heaven, and finds vent in stern self-upbraidings for faults and blemishes which com-

mon men would not notice in themselves, and none but the saintly would mourn, will be construed as if it were the positive testimony of a witness on the stand, to guilt as grievous as the terms in which it is stated are strong. The impressions of a desponding mood; the emotions of an hour of joy; the sudden feeling aroused by a *real* wrong from an enemy, or an imagined injury from a friend; the fancy that flits through the mind; the doubt that passes over it like the shadow of a cloud; the superstitious feeling that for a moment weighs upon the heart, and which the wisest men cannot always shake off; — all these, or any one of them, merely because they are noted down, are read as if they were established convictions, settled opinions, confirmed habits; and as if, having been once experienced, they must needs be stamped upon the character and fixed in the life for ever.

But the diary of Increase Mather does not support the charges that rest upon it. It does not establish the imputation of selfish and mean motives. It does not show that he was a self-seeker. It does not convict him of being influenced by any sinister purposes in his management of the affairs of church, state, or college. There are some entries, indeed, which one so disposed might easily turn into ridicule; there are some, that, judged by a modern standard, might seem superstitious and credulous; there are some which might be thought to indicate a degree of self-esteem hardly to be expected in a mature Christian, — yet often seen in the diaries of the best, though likely to be overrated by the reader, who forgets that the journalist wrote only *of* himself and *for* himself; and, after

all, not greater, I imagine, than might be detected in the very persons who sneer at it, if all *their* private feelings were written down,—and there are other passages which show, that, like other men, he had some imperfections; enough to give opportunity for the exercise of blessed charity in his human judges, and sweet mercy in the Divine. But, notwithstanding all these, it is full of the sincerest piety and the strongest faith; it overflows with prayer,—prayer gentle and tender as a little child's, and strong and urgent as the passionate wrestlings of a powerful spirit breaking its way through doubts and darkness to come nearer to peace and God. It clearly shows that the master-passion was not ambition, but piety; that the ruling purpose was not self-aggrandisement, but the glory of his Maker; that, whatever his faults, he longed and strove to correct them; and, whatever his weaknesses, he sincerely thirsted after righteousness, and heartily loved his God.

If the secrets of all our hearts were revealed; if every thought and purpose were disclosed; if all our hidden motives were brought into the light; if every imagination and desire and day-dream of our solitary hours were exposed to the inspection of earth and heaven; few, very few, would have less for which to blush before the world, and less for which to be ashamed before the Almighty, than, judging from his diary alone, would he whose life we have been reviewing.

And now I gladly turn from considering the charges against him, to take one more glance at his life, as history has represented it to us in his latter days. The fire that burned so warmly in his manhood, old age did not quench.

His preaching was still vigorous, even at fourscore years. Large congregations, as at first, gathered to listen to him, and "lost no appetite for his instructions" because he had fed them so long.* The churches loved his venerable presence, and "would not permit an ordination," we are told, "to be carried on without him, as long as he was able to be conveyed to them in a coach." His pen, that had written so much, did not become idle or weary, nor lose any thing of its power in his tremulous hand.

On the fiftieth anniversary of his settlement, he requested a dismissal from the church; but they would not listen to it; though afterwards, "to render his old age easy to him, they wisely and kindly voted that the labors of the pulpit should be expected of him only when he should find himself able and inclined for them." His last sickness, though long and painful, and attended with occasional depression of spirits, was patiently borne in expectation of rest and reward; and when he died, at length, on the bosom of his son, it was with repeated ejaculations of joyous belief and hope that he should on that day be with Christ in Paradise.†

The day of his death was a day of general mourning. An honorable funeral was given him, such as few citizens had been known to receive before; and every testimony of

* It is said that notes were not unfrequently taken of his later sermons by stenographers, for private circulation and for the press.

† On being told, one day, that his excellent friend, Mr. Thomas Hollis, of London, was inquisitive in his letters whether he was yet *in the land of the living*, he replied, "No! tell him I am going to it. This poor world is the land of the *dying*. 'Tis heaven that is the true land of the living."

affection and veneration accompanied him to the tomb.* "The feelings of that day have passed away; the eyes that knew him, and wept for him, have long been sealed in death; and other generations have risen, and gone by, and been forgotten. But the name of Increase Mather still lives; and, when hundreds of generations shall have sunk to irrecoverable oblivion, he shall still be hailed as one of the early worthies of New England."†

But it is time that we should pass on, in our survey, to the characters of succeeding pastors and the record of later events. It will not seem to you that I have devoted too large a proportion of this discourse to our second minister, if, in connection with the fact that he presided over the Second Church nearly one-third of the whole period of its existence, you regard his distinguished abilities, his important services both to church and state, and also the necessity that was laid upon me to endeavor to rescue his character, at least with this congregation, from opprobrium and forgetfulness. If I have delineated that character in lines of truth, and you can trust the fidelity of the sketch, as I am sure you trust the purity of my purpose in defending him, his moral portrait will henceforth hang in the minds of yourselves and your children above the reach of ridicule or reproach, as the likeness, not, indeed, of a faultless, but of an eminently useful and holy man.

The only important event relating to the history of the

* Hon. Wm. Dummer, Lieut. Governor; Chief Justice Sewall; the President of the College; and three of the principal clergymen, — were pallbearers. The students of Cambridge, a multitude of ministers, and citizens of every rank, joined the funeral procession.

† Henry Ware, jun.

Second Church that took place towards the close of the ministry of Increase Mather, was the amicable separation of a part of his society, which had become too numerous for their meeting-house, in order to the establishment of a new church at the north part of the city, called afterwards the "New North," of which Dr. Parkman was recently the respected pastor.

It is also worth recording here, that the number of admissions to the church during the ministry of the elder Mather was over one thousand; and the number of baptisms recorded—the record being incomplete previous to the year 1689—was about thirty-three hundred.*

* The exact numbers during the ministry of Increase and Cotton Mather were of *admissions*, eleven hundred and four, and of *baptisms*, for the thirty-nine years during which the record is complete, three thousand three hundred and eighty-four.



Cotton Mather, Sr.

SECOND PERIOD.

FROM THE DEATH OF INCREASE MATHER, 1723, TO 1768.

COTTON MATHER. — JOSHUA GEE. — SAMUEL MATHER.
SAMUEL CHECKLEY.

THE name that stands next on the list of the pastors of the Second Church has been for a century more familiarly mentioned and more widely known than that of any other New England minister.* Its celebrity, however, is less enviable than extensive. It is seldom mentioned but in association with some anecdote of credulity, quaintness, or oddity, that excites a smile; or some instance of superstition, irritability, or vanity, that provokes a sneer. Yet, notwithstanding the universality of his fame, the quantity

* Cotton Mather, son of Increase and Maria, — daughter of the celebrated John Cotton, from whom he took his Christian name, — was born in Boston, Thursday, Feb. 12, 1662-3. He was educated at the Free School in Boston, under the care, first of Benjamin Thompson, a good classical scholar and a poet; and, afterwards, of the famous Ezekiel Cheever. At the age of twelve years, he had made such advance in Latin and Greek as to be thoroughly prepared to enter Harvard College. He took his first degree with marked distinction at sixteen, and his second before he was quite nineteen. On account of an impediment in his speech, fearing that he should not be able to preach, he first studied medicine. But, having overcome his stammering by persevering efforts, he devoted himself to his favorite study, theology. After having for a long time hesitated to accept the call of the Second Church, he was at length ordained as colleague with his father, May 13, 1685.

that has been written and spoken concerning him, and the quite distinct impression of him which the generality of persons suppose they have formed, I am convinced that few historical characters are less understood than COTTON MATHER. He has paid the penalty always attached to singularity. The protuberance of a few eccentricities has thrown all the elements of his character into false perspective. His oddities stand in the light of his virtues. They give a grotesqueness to his whole image. They mark the man so strongly that all who see *them* imagine they understand *him*. "This is himself, and nobody else," people say; and therefore they think they know *who* and *what* he is, and all that is worth knowing about him. They conclude they have a true likeness, when they have only a broad caricature, founded upon some odd feature or two; and, with a smile of satisfaction at their own penetration and his peculiarities, inquire no deeper.

But those who know only the eccentricities of Cotton Mather know little about him. Those who suppose they comprehend him, because they are familiar with the current anecdotes about him, or imagine that he could be fairly sketched by a few strong touches, could not be under a greater misapprehension. The truth is, few characters are less intelligible; few harder to describe; few are so many-sided; few have so little uniformity; few have so great a variety of qualities, in such strange admixture; few show such supposed inconsistencies; few present themselves in such ever-shifting positions and hues, such kaleidoscopic changes and combinations; few exhibit such surprising contrasts, such an apparent jumble of great and small,

sharp and flat, wise and simple, saintly and ordinary. To group all these elements together, to arrange and blend them into any thing like a complete and satisfactory portrait, would be a task that requires more penetration and skill than have ever yet been exercised upon his biography. It is a task, certainly, which I have neither the disposition, the time, nor the ability to perform.

All that I shall attempt in this brief sketch is merely to rectify the false perspective to which I have referred; to arrange the qualities of the man, so far as I have occasion to notice them, in what seems to me to be the order of nature; to change the caricature into a true picture; to remove whatever distortion is the result merely of the point of view, and not inherent in the person. There are few faces that have not some unhandsome feature, or do not look less pleasing in one aspect than in another. By mere arrangement of position, the artist can exaggerate or relieve the deformity. As well might *he* say that the single view in which the defect is most conspicuous is the only one true to nature, while in every other it is softened, and in some almost wholly concealed, as the biographer insist upon presenting the character he describes in the very attitude and drapery to set off a weakness, or make an eccentricity ridiculous. If men of distinguished virtues and learning and intense activity sometimes do or say a foolish thing, they must not be brought on the stage before the world in a fool's cap and feathers, as if that were a true representation of their real character, — as if in sober, actual life they acted no higher and more earnest part. Let their folly be ridiculed, but not at the expense of their

wisdom. Let men laugh at their oddities, but not at the cost of a just respect for their virtues.

I undertake, however, no defence of Cotton Mather. I have no wish, and feel no call, to be his apologist. I would not cover a single fault in him or any man, except under the mantle of charity, which is transparent to the truth, which does not hide the weakness over which it is thrown, but only, as a sign of sanctuary, protects it from illiberal judgment. Every character, essentially useful and good, can bear its own faults, though many, and can bear to have them seen. They serve, in part, to set off its virtues. They are, to a certain extent, the shadows that give prominence and relief to its nobler features. At any rate, they are human, and bring us into sympathy with a man, as much as his virtues; while they show us also, that those virtues, like our own, were nurtured in the school of difficulty and temptation, trained in battle, and are all of them victories. And that Cotton Mather can bear *his* faults, if he is looked at as every man should be, is what I think can be fairly proved; and it is all I wish to prove. Nevertheless, I must confess, that, even before I had studied Cotton Mather in his own writings and acts, separately from the coloring of modern biographers and the attitude in which historians had placed him, a suspicion had long haunted me, that his faults had been unintentionally exaggerated. There is something in the heart that warns us to be wary of wholesale censure, to look behind stereotyped terms of reproach, and not to take ignominious brands as unquestionable proofs of guilt. If the fact of having obeyed this voice beforehand is to be regarded a prejudice that must

needs vitiate the justice of a biographical sketch, though I must regret the penalty, I cannot deny the weakness.

The faults of Cotton Mather, as has been hinted, are conspicuous and well known,—too conspicuous, I think, in the usual regard and general representation of him. They are precisely such as are calculated to provoke dislike and excite prejudice, though, essentially, not so criminal as some which would be less impatiently judged. If, indeed, they were more positive and substantial than his virtues; if they involved malice; if they indicated a bad heart; if they were really the stronger and deeper marks of the man; if they were the rule of his life, and not the exception,—then justice might demand, and nature would allow, such a forward presentation of them as would not only overtop his virtues, but cast over his whole moral countenance that dark shade which is the righteous stigma of the unworthy. But it is not so. Precisely the opposite is true of him. His virtues are in nature far more prominent and striking than his faults. The latter are more accidental and occasional; the former, more constant and permanent. The one seem to have been rather temporary waverings from the real point of his life's aim, like the oscillations of the disturbed needle; while the other evidently mark the true line of his earlier and later aspirations, principles, and efforts. With such convictions,—though admitting every fault that can justly be charged against him, and intending to bring them all into distinct notice in the proper time and order,—I would first present his character to you, as it presents itself to me, in the light of its virtues.

In the first place, *he wore no disguise*. There is hardly a character in history that had so little concealment. What he felt he uttered. What he thought he said. With too much freedom, it may be considered; imprudently, you may say; with undue heat often. No matter: he wore no disguise over his failings. Men saw and heard the worst of him, and the whole of the worst. He had no tact to conceal his faults. If he had been more cunning, he would have passed for a much better man; but whether he would have *been* any better, you can judge. If he had had a little more caution, he might have kept all his worst feelings, and nobody been the wiser for it; might have been a good deal more unworthy, and met a far milder judgment. With a trifle more tact, he would have saved himself much ridicule and a multitude of enemies, though he would really have been not a whit more respectable or amiable. This is something: it is a good deal. If you are sure you see the worst of a man, you can have confidence in all that appears good in him. You can pardon the more to a person in whom you know how much you *have* to pardon.

Pass next to his *industry*. It was immense, almost unparalleled. You may say it was in some respects misdirected; that much of it was wasted upon acquirements which were valueless, and learning that was but trash. Be it so. But he *worked*,—worked as hard and as much as any man that ever lived. He seized and used every minute with wonderful method and energy. And he did this conscientiously. He was industrious from principle. He *thought* that the learning he amassed and the attainments after which he toiled were desirable and important;

and he sincerely intended to turn them to account, to enrich his sermons, and for the furtherance of the gospel. And the men of his own age thought as he did, or they would not so generally have applauded, almost envied, him as a prodigy of erudition.

But all his industry was not spent in heaping up knowledge, and writing many books. It was employed, to an extent that seems hardly consistent with so much study, in plans and acts of usefulness.

And here another distinguished virtue comes before us, in connection with his diligence, — *his earnest desire and constant purpose to do good*. It seems to have been one of his earliest motives, his ruling aim from childhood, to do all the good, and every kind of good, in his power. That a deep sense of this obligation impressed and governed him in boyhood needs no better proof than the fact, that, while pursuing his own studies at home, he spent a considerable part of every day in instructing, not only his brothers and sisters, but the domestics also; while his sedulous watchfulness of the wants of those around him, and his ingenious alacrity in rendering to them every trifling service in his power, were proverbial in the family. This purpose and habit followed him through life, and rather strengthened with his age.

One of his best books, — a book to the remarkable value of which we have the testimony of a man whose sound judgment and keen discrimination make his opinion an authority; I allude to Benjamin Franklin, who said that he attributed to that book all his usefulness and eminence, — the “*Essays to do Good*,” evidently grew out of

his own life. Its valuable maxims and principles were wrought out of his own experience, and illustrated in his own habits. In the Essays he says, "There is a scorbutic and spontaneous lassitude in the minds of men, which, while it sometimes prevents their being active in evil, is also the cause of their doing so little good." The object of the book is to counteract this propensity to indolence by suggesting motives to action, reasons for exertion, and methods of usefulness. No man can read the book without benefit, without being stirred to increased diligence, and supplied with hints that will be of constant service to him in his self-discipline. He seems to have looked forward with "a prophetic anticipation" to an age of intense activity, whose description, as he has given it in his peculiar style, answers very aptly to the present: "A vast variety of new ways to do good will be hit upon; paths which no fowl (of the best flight at noble designs) has yet known, and which the vulture's most piercing eye hath not seen, and where lions of the strongest resolution have not passed." He suggests, moreover, the expediency of resorting to the *principle of association*, in order to accomplish by the authority and force of numbers what individuals are unable to do. "There is reason to think that this suggestion, though not new, was adopted to some extent in consequence of his recommendation; and thus was established the system which now operates throughout the country."*

A curious instance of his ingenuity in plans of doing good is worth noticing in this connection. He had heard

* Rev. W. B. O. Peabody: "Life of Cotton Mather."

that in the town of Salem there was a large number of poor and bad people, who were notorious for misspending the sabbath. In order to reach them, and if possible bring them to church, he hit upon an expedient that shows as much knowledge of human nature as goodness of heart. Having wrapped up seven small parcels of money, attached to seven tracts on "Repentance," and seven also on "Keeping the Sabbath," he sent the packages, with an anonymous letter, to the minister of that place, desiring him to distribute the charity *in his own name*; that so, perchance, the pastor might ingratiate himself with his straying people, and, by awakening their good feelings towards himself personally, draw them to public worship. A better conceived plan, acting in so many ways at the same time, and all converging to one result, could not easily be found.

There is hardly a branch of philanthropic enterprise, into which his interest and exertions did not spread. Nor did he wait for others to take the lead, or show him objects of charity, but with quick sympathy discovered the wants and sufferings of all classes of men, with ready ingenuity devised plans of relief, and with characteristic zeal carried them into operation himself, often with much expense and labor, without waiting for assistance from others. Most of the reformatory and benevolent movements which have signalized the last quarter of a century were anticipated by him. He was a strenuous advocate of *Temperance*, by example as well as precept. He wrote and published much on the subject, with learning and ability, and not altogether without effect in staying the alarming progress of one of the most prevalent vices of his times. He was

deeply interested on behalf of *Seamen*. To the moral exposures and hardships of this interesting class, he frequently called the attention of others; while he spared no exertion on his own part to ameliorate and elevate their condition. Of the claims of *Women*, for whose sex he seems to have had a high respect, he was an earnest advocate; and to raise the standard of female character and education was one of his favorite objects. His treatment of the *Slaves* then held in New England, and his devotion to the temporal and religious improvement of the African race, are among the brightest points of his benevolent character. Perceiving that the slaves in Boston were destitute of the advantages of education, and finding that their ignorance was a bar to their religious progress, he established a school for their instruction, and bore the whole expense of it himself, paying the teacher for her services at the close of every week. In addition to this, he had deeply at heart the Christianization of Negroes abroad as well as at home, and, besides incidental attempts to call attention to the subject, prepared a work upon it, with his best diligence, expressly for circulation in the West Indies, as well as in America. The noble stand he took for the introduction of *Inoculation* for the small-pox, against the powerful and universal prejudice of the people, and even of the most eminent physicians,* and the enmity and obloquy it cost him, should

* With a single exception, Dr. Zabdiel Boylston. The rage of the people was so fierce against Cotton Mather that he was in danger of his life. Every possible threat was made to intimidate him; and the physicians, and many of the first men, together with the mob, assailed and reviled him. But he never faltered. A hand-grenade was actually thrown, in the night, into the chamber where he usually slept, but fortunately, as it passed

never be forgot. Especially at the present hour should the honor of this great service be acknowledged, and all due praise be awarded to Cotton Mather, when the tardy justice of nations is at length stimulated to rear a deserved monument to the name of the great benefactor to whom the world is indebted for a still better antidote to one of its worst miseries.*

Association for *Christian Missions* to the heathen was another of his favorite objects; though he says with much point, that, till the church is purified at home, there will be no gathering of the nations into it; and that many persons active in missionary operations "will be more intent upon propagating their *own little forms, fancies, and interests, than the more weighty matters of the gospel.*" He proposes also *Bible Societies*, for the circulation of the Scriptures and other holy books, and for their translation into the various languages of the world.† And he still further advises the formation of *Tradesmen's Libraries*, and associations for moral and religious improvement among young men. This enumeration‡ of the various philanthropic plans which not only excited his interest, but actually originated

through the window, had its fusee broken off. The clergymen of Boston alone took his part, and, to their honor be it said, followed his example in advocating the unpopular but invaluable innovation.

* A subscription is about being made for a monument to Dr. Jenner.

† We are told that he made himself master of French and Spanish, so that he might write treatises in those languages; and, in his forty-fifth year, "conquered the *Iroquois Indian*," in which he actually published works for the instruction of the natives.

‡ I might have swelled the list. I have not mentioned his attempts to organize a *Peace Society*; an association for *Building Churches in Destitute Places*, and for the *Relief of Poor Ministers*; nor the establishment by him of *Charity Schools*; nor his *Distribution of Books* in immense numbers.

in his own active and fruitful mind, affords abundant evidence no less of extraordinary genius for practical benevolence than of a sympathetic and generous disposition.

Nor did his benevolence become weak by diffusiveness, or expend itself in extensive efforts. No individual case of poverty or suffering within his reach escaped his notice, or failed of receiving personal care. One day in every week was set apart particularly to the consideration of the question, "*What special subjects of affliction and objects of compassion may I take under my particular care? and what shall I do for them?*" A catalogue was then prepared of all the poor in his flock, or in the town, whom he knew, together with all the miserable, the victims of vice, and those who were *out of employment*. This "List of the Miserables," as he called it, was generally kept about him, and, by being occasionally referred to in his visits, afforded him opportunities to introduce any particular case to the attention and sympathy of his parishioners, and thus to procure a recruit either of alms or almoners, or both, to assist him in his charities.

Of such a man it may indeed be said with truth, in the language of one who knew him well, "The ambition and character of his life was serviceableness." The tree that bears such crowded and broad-spreading branches, sprinkled with the blossoms of kindness, and bending with the fruits of charity, cannot but be known, however rough its trunk and irregular its outline, as having its root and invigoration in the rich soil of love.*

* The emblem on Cotton Mather's signet-ring was a tree, with the motto, from Psalm i. 3, "He shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of

The utter absence of avarice was a noble distinction of Cotton Mather; and not less so the fact, that he never spared himself, when an opportunity offered, to do any thing for another's good,—that self-indulgence was totally unknown to him. Another admirable trait, which no one can deny to him, is moral courage. It manifested itself, in his boyhood, in open resistance and rebuke of whatever he esteemed unjust or immoral in his companions. It is conspicuous, throughout his life, in his never having shrunk from uttering what he believed to be true, or doing what he thought to be right, because of the ridicule to which it would expose him, or the unpopularity it would provoke. It was displayed on several occasions of public excitement, in the stand he took to resist oppressive rulers on the one hand, or to quell the turbulence of the populace on the other. But never was it more severely tested or more honorably proved than in his efforts to introduce inoculation, to which I have already referred.

That he was a man of a devout spirit and a religious character has never, I believe, been questioned. The tone of his piety has been objected to, but not his piety itself. His religious exercises may not always meet with approbation; but his religious affections and principles can be discredited only after the largest portion of the facts of his biography shall have been expunged.

water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season: his leaf also shall not wither." This was the ceremonial ring of his Doctorate of Divinity; the honor of which degree was conferred upon him by the University of Glasgow, A.D. 1710. On the scroll was the Latin sentence, *Glascua rigavit*,—"Glasgow watered it." We are told that it was his habit, when looking at this ring, to pray *that God would make him a very fruitful tree.*

In his relations to the Second Church, we are bound to speak of him with unqualified praise ; for slander itself, with all its boldness, has not ventured to cast a reproach upon the sincerity of his pastoral affection, or the fidelity of his ministerial service.

Another province of his life also calumny has not violated. In the domestic relations, his character shines with a mild and beautiful lustre. The mutual attachment between him and his father, in particular, cannot be contemplated without a delightful interest. Whatever the son may have been to others, to his parent he was always respectful and tender and amiable. His veneration for him was almost unbounded ; his love to him through life was as warm as a boy's. His indignation took fire at a whisper against his fame ; and his heart leaped with joy at every mark of respect that was conferred upon him. And the manifestations on the father's part are no less constant and sincere. He evidently looked upon his son with admiration as well as love, and reposed in him with perfect confidence. His treatment of him through life and in death, and the terms in which he speaks of him in his last testament, are, from such a man, no slight testimonials to his worth. They were united in the closest intimacy ; their studies were similar ; their profession the same ; their charge one ; their earthly and their heavenly interests inseparable. Their voices alternated or blended in the worship of the church, and mingled often in private devotion. They were never happier than when together, and never more constantly and closely together than when the hour of their separation drew nigh. The son, though himself an old man, could

not let his father go, till he had reverently gathered all the last fruits of his wisdom, and heard yet again the counsels of his love; while the father was not content to have his son long absent from his sight, and evidently felt it a comfort to die on his bosom.* — (See APPENDIX D.)

Cotton Mather was also one of the kindest of fathers. It is the testimony of one of his sons, that he was not, like many parents of that day, of an austere carriage towards his children, "nor kept himself at an haughty distance from them, but invariably condescended to them with a gentle and proper familiarity. Thus," he adds, "he would instruct and edify, thus allure and charm us; thus make us love his society, ever come into it with delight, and never leave it but with sorrow." The same attractions of manner and conversation seem to have characterized him in social intercourse. It is evidently a mistake to suppose, as some have done, that he was generally crabbed, morose, and irritable, and not fitted for an agreeable companion. On the

* The paragraph in the "Last Will," to which reference was made above, is in the following terms: "Concerning my son, Cotton Mather, he has bin a great comfort to me from his childhood, having bin a very dutiful son, and a singular blessing to his father's family and flock. If I had any considerable estate, I ought to bequeath the greatest part of it to him. It has bin thot that I have bags by me, which is a great mistake. I have not twenty pounds in silver or in bills. But whatever I have, be it more or less, whether in silver or bills, I give it to him, my eldest son. Item, I give to him my pendulum-watch; item, my pendulum-clock; item, my silver tankard; and I bequeath to him all my manuscripts, and the one-half of my library."

The will itself, which was never recorded, was found on file, and a copy furnished to me by my friend, Dr. Shurtleff. It is an interesting document, marked by the dignity, seriousness, and kindness which belonged to the author. It has seemed to me so characteristic of the man, that I have inserted it entire in an Appendix.

contrary, none could be more sociable and entertaining. Better authority on this point could not be desired than that of Mr. Colman, of the Brattle-street Church; who, if any one, would have been likely, during a long and sometimes trying intercourse, to have had full experience of the opposite qualities, if they had been prominent and habitual. I may be pardoned, therefore, for quoting at length, from a sermon preached by that eminent divine at the Thursday Lecture, a somewhat striking passage, descriptive of the traits to which I have referred:—"His printed works will not convey to posterity, nor give to strangers, a just idea of the real worth and great learning of the man. They will, indeed, inform all that read them, of his great knowledge and singular piety, his zeal for God and holiness and truth, and his desire of the salvation of precious souls; but it was *conversation*, and acquaintance with him in his familiar and occasional discourses and private communications, that discovered the vast compass of his knowledge and the projections of his piety, more, I have sometimes thought, than all his pulpit exercises. *Here he excelled; here he shone*,—being exceedingly communicative, and bringing out of his treasures things new and old without measure. Here it was seen how his wit and fancy, his invention, his quickness of thought and ready apprehension, were all consecrated to God, as well as his heart, will, and affections; and, out of his abundance within, his lips overflowed, dropped as the honeycomb, fed all that came near him, and were as the choice silver for richness and brightness, pleasure and profit." The well-known warning to visitors,*

* "Be short."

inscribed upon his study-door, might be construed into an unsocial hint as well as an admonition of the value of time, were it not a well-authenticated fact, that all who knocked were readily admitted, and, when once within, found the occupant so entertaining and talkative, that he himself made it as difficult for them to obey the motto as it was agreeable to themselves to disregard it.

His views and mode of education and discipline were as judicious as they were in advance of his age. "He believed that children were alive to principles of reason and honor at a much earlier period of life than is generally supposed. He endeavored, first of all, to convince his own children of his *affection*, and in that way to lead them to the belief that to follow his judgment was the best way to secure their own good. He impressed upon them, that it was *shameful* to do wrong; and, when one of them had offended, his first punishment was to express his astonishment that the child could do any thing so unworthy. Removal from his presence was his ordinary punishment; and it was only in extreme and peculiar cases that he ever inflicted a blow. He rewarded obedience by teaching them some curious piece of knowledge, which he had always at command; and thus, beside giving the immediate recompense of good conduct, he conveyed the impression, that to gain instruction was not a hardship, but a privilege and reward. If they deserved censure, he would forbid their reading and writing; a prohibition which was strongly associated in their minds with degradation. He early led their minds to religious thoughts and contemplations, giving them views which were as solemn as possible,

but taking care to make them sensible of the *goodness of God*. He often told them of the good angels, whose office it was to protect them, and who ought never to be offended by misconduct or neglect; but he would not say much to them about the *evil angels*, because he would not have them entertain any frightful fancies.”*

To this list of virtues might be added purity of life, unstained, so far as is known, or even suspected, by a single blot; subjection of the appetites, even to their mortification; systematic self-regulation, in conformity to rules which he conscientiously believed to be of divine sanction; love of “the just liberties of mankind,† — for this also may be ranked with the virtues, having its root and issue in justice; — and a firm and faithful patriotism, which, if not one of the sacred sisterhood, consorts with that high company.

Moreover, if the closing hours of life are ever a touchstone of character, — and no man should be judged till he has passed through them, — Cotton Mather bore that test well, and under circumstances peculiarly favorable for its application. For his intellect was not affected by disease; it was impossible that he could cheat himself with any hope of recovery; he knew that eternity was close at hand; and yet there was not such suddenness or hurry of preparation as to produce excitement, or prevent his true inward condition from being seen. And with regard to that condition,

* Life of Cotton Mather, by his Son.

† His hatred of oppression manifested itself by indubitable signs. He was very bold to rebuke injustice in magistrates and great men. “I declare,” he says, “for the just liberties of mankind, with a free indulgence of civil rights in the state.”

and the entire truthfulness of his feelings, no man who examines his death-scene, ever so critically, can entertain a doubt, — there is no room for doubt. Perfectly resigned and collected, sustained by “a strong consolation,” declaring that “every thing looked smiling about him,” full of hope without elation, and of longing without impatience, he awaited his last hour. “And now, vain world, farewell! Thou hast been to me an uneasy wilderness. Welcome, everlasting life! The best hour that ever I saw is that for which I am gladly waiting. The paradise of God stands open to me. Covered with Christ’s righteousness, brighter than an angel’s drapery, I will go in at those golden gates; for I have something to do within. I will go in, and praise the Lord. It is what I have begun to do; and his praise endureth for ever. Never, never shall I give over the doing of it.” His desire of being useful was strong in death. His own great need did not withdraw his thoughts from others’ good. With all his remaining energies he labored to impart instruction to all who came near him, and to stamp upon their minds sacred and enduring impressions. He wished, above all things, to glorify his heavenly Father by bringing forth fruit even on the bed of death. When his son, and afterwards his successor in this church, on the sabbath before he died, leaning over him to catch his last counsels, asked what single word or sentence, of condensed wisdom, he could give him, as the most precious keepsake, to carry about always, in remembrance of his father and for his own guidance, the instant and earnest response was the single but talismanic word “FRUITFUL.” His heart was full of affection towards all, and his mouth overflowed with

blessings. "All delusions faded" from his mind, all infirmities fell off from his spirit, "as he drew near to the grave." He seemed to lay aside his foibles with his pilgrim-cloak, as if they had been but superficial stains. The clouds that sometimes obscured his sky melted away as his sun went down; and its setting was in mild glory. The beautiful sentence of holy writ which he often repeated at the last was strikingly fulfilled in himself: "It shall come to pass, that at evening-time it shall be light." *

And now, can this person, with such virtues, with such aims, whose life was devoted to such objects and crowned with such an end, have been other than an essentially righteous and intrinsically good man? It is impossible to find any key to the interpretation of his history, any explanation of the main and constant facts of his life, any harmony between his works and his motives, any congruity between his line of conduct and his line of purpose, except on the principle that he was really conscientious, benevolent, and devout.

But, if this be a true verdict, it will not be overthrown, but rather confirmed, by an examination of his faults. For

* He died the thirteenth of February, 1728, the day after his sixty-fifth birth-day. It surprises me that so accurate a writer as Mr. Peabody, in his biographical article in "Sparks's American Biography," should have said, "His son, in accordance with the principle on which his father's 'Life' is written, — to withhold all such information as might interest the reader, — *does not say what the disorder was.*" He states expressly, that "he died of an hard cough with a suffocating asthma, with a fever." With all the love and respect I cherish for my lamented friend and brother, I feel constrained to say, that he has treated the "Life of Cotton Mather, by his Son," too severely. That "Life" gives a very fair picture of his father, — which is its principal object, — without showing much genius or ability.

not only is the preponderance of a good man's virtues made manifest by weighing them against his faults, but his virtues are to some extent illustrated by his faults; while his faults, on the other hand, are in some degree explained and lightened by his virtues. He might not have *had* certain faults, if he had not possessed in a high measure certain virtues; and, but for the eminence of certain virtues, certain faults would have looked far more diminutive, or might have altogether escaped notice.

On turning our attention to the shaded side of Cotton Mather's character, the first thing that gives an unfavorable impression is its *grotesqueness*, which has the appearance of affectation and vanity. If such is really its nature, it certainly deserves ridicule, and is open to censure. But that it is really or wholly attributable to these unworthy causes is not to be taken for granted without investigation. For singularity, of itself, is not necessarily a fault, nor always an affectation. And it is no sure evidence of its being either, that it seems to us disagreeable or ridiculous. Some men are singular by nature. Some are so from a disproportionate development in a particular direction, owing to a strong original bias, or some accidental pressure early and long applied. Every person *appears* eccentric to us whom we do not understand; though, if we were more thoroughly acquainted with him, or less exclusive in our opinions and limited in our judgment, we might be able to trace his peculiarities to some high law, and discover that justification of them which is apparent to himself. The singularity which we see in Cotton Mather, so far as I can understand it, is to be attributed, partly to his nature; partly

to circumstances and education; partly to the complexity and variety of his character and the exuberance of his endeavors and acquisitions, which render him unintelligible to us, and probably also to himself; and partly, no doubt, to vanity. For that *vanity* was one of his faults, and probably the most prominent of them all, is too apparent to be denied.

But the vanity of Cotton Mather is as peculiar as himself, and has a most remarkable history,—a history in which we may find abundant instruction for ourselves, if not a partial justification for him. Descended from a double line of the most distinguished clergymen of New England, and inheriting the name of both, he was regarded from infancy with more than ordinary interest, and the first indication of the qualities of his nature was waited for with anxious expectation. A strong hope was cherished by parents and friends, that he might prove himself worthy of the venerated names he bore, and sustain, through another generation, the pure fame and sacred honors which his progenitors had so long enjoyed. With a delight they could not disguise, and a gratitude to God that found indiscreet expression even in the hearing of their son, they hailed the early signs of unusual promise which dawned upon them as his faculties unfolded. It was evident that he was an extraordinary child. He was treated as such from his cradle. He was made to understand it. His mother expressed it in her looks, his father in his prayers, and both in their counsels and encouragements. He was taught to feel how much depended upon him, and how much was expected of him. He must set his mark high,

very high. Eminent he must be, — not, certainly, without virtue and piety, — but eminent in these also, yes, in these especially. Learned he must be too; for learning had been the glory of his fathers; and scholarship, with his mother also, and his grandmother, had been coupled with Christian excellence, in their intercessions for their sons. The boy caught the desired inspiration. His ambition took fire before the time. He had a rich nature, more than ordinary genius, abundance of talent, remarkable energy, and no vicious propensities; and, with such endowments, had he been allowed to come forward in the natural way, and not been early subjected to undue stimulus and a forced culture, he would undoubtedly have been, though less of a wonder, a greater man. And what is more, he would not have been inoculated with the vanity that disturbed his peace, troubled his virtues, and has tarnished his fame.

But, unfortunately for him, the flame that had been kindled at home was not, as is often the case, quenched when he came in contact with the world, and passed into the care of less partial instructors. At school he was treated as a prodigy; and he *was* a prodigy, for he entered it with the ambition of a man stimulating a more than boyish intellect. His teachers, rejoicing in such a willing pupil, and proud of the rapidity of his progress, were but too ready to lend their aid to his precocious development. They did not need to quicken, and they had neither the wisdom nor the self-denial to restrain him. By his twelfth year, they had carried him through the most difficult Greek and Latin authors, and presented him for admission to the

college, already more learned in the classics than most who had taken their degrees.

And here, too, as if all the world were in league against his simplicity, the first greeting of the venerable President was in terms too flattering for a higher measure of modesty and discretion than is within the compass of a mere boy, to have borne without injury. If the account of his college-life that has come down to us is true, — and there is certainly no reason to discredit it, — the venerable Presidents of that institution cannot be held guiltless of having been accessory to his vanity. Dr. Hoar, in whose Presidency the young Mather entered, with a compliment not the less dangerous because of its gracefulness, borrowing from classic poetry a prophecy of his future celebrity, likened him to the young Telemachus; giving him this head for his initial declamation: —

“*Telemacho veniet, vivat modo, fortior ætas.*”

And President Oakes, under whom he graduated, as if not to be outdone by his predecessor, honored him, in his Latin oration at commencement, with a eulogy that, however merited, no considerations can justify: —

“Mather is named Cotton Mather. What a name! My hearers, I mistake: I ought to have said what names! I shall not speak of his father; for I dare not praise him to his face.” — Why did it not occur to him that it would have been less hazardous and improper than to have so praised the son? — “But should he resemble his venerable grandfathers, John Cotton and Richard Mather, in piety, learning, splendor of intellect, solidity of judgment, pru-

dence, and wisdom, he will indeed bear the palm. And I have confidence, that, in this young man, Cotton and Mather will be united, and flourish again."

He must have been a far less susceptible and obedient pupil than he was, if his vanity had not developed apace under such respected tuition, and in the midst of such fostering influences. The only wonder is, that he was not completely ruined. He would have been so, but for his early and substantial piety, his unusual energy and perseverance, his real love of learning, and his conscientious diligence. Every thing was done to spoil him; and that he was not spoiled is an honor to his head and his heart.

His early tastes, his earnest piety, and his strong sense of religious obligation, though they could not avail to rescue him altogether from the strong influences that roused his ambition, were powerful enough to turn that ambition into a right and holy direction. Ambition mingled, indeed, with his religious aspirations; but their superior power bore it along with themselves in their own upward flight. They could not divest themselves altogether of its influence; but they pressed that influence into their own service. And this, I think, is the true explanation of all that is peculiar and faulty in his religious character. He was even more ambitious, from his infancy, of the very highest attainments and experiences of *piety*, than of eminence in any other direction. He had read the biographies of the most distinguished saints; and he longed to mount up to the same heights of holy meditation and rapturous intercourse with heaven to which they had soared. His youthful imagination was excited by the history of their

vigils and fasts and ascetic enterprises; and his soul was stirred to repeat and rival them in his own experience and discipline. In the most impressible period of life, and with a mind of peculiar susceptibility, especially as to religious impressions, his closet companions were such books as Hall's "Treatise of Meditation" and Scudder's "Christian's Daily Walk," whose enthusiasm he eagerly caught, and whose sternest directions he endeavored systematically to put in practice. Thus his religious nature, at the outset, was forced above its strength, and beyond what its health could bear. The beautiful simplicity and freedom of a childish piety he was never permitted to enjoy. He aimed and was encouraged to leap into sainthood, when he should have been almost unconsciously advancing along the delightful path of peace, under the easy tuition of parental gentleness, and the soft constraint of the Holy Spirit, whose measure of influence is dispensed in most delicate harmony with the laws of the mind, and nicely balanced proportion to the growing capacity of the soul. When we have become familiar with his early religious history, we cease to wonder and to blame, — for all other emotions are swallowed up in pity and regret, — while we read of his long and oft-repeated fasts, his ascetic mortifications and vigils, his ecstasies and raptures in hours of nervous exhaustion and excitement, and his most exact system of devotional and practical duty, running out into the smallest trifles, and giving an air of formality and design, not only to every act of daily life, but even to every prayer and ejaculation of his most private moments. We cease, I say, to wonder and to blame; for we can trace all these extravagances back to

causes independent of his nature or his will. Nay more, to a certain extent our censure is changed into admiration at the perseverance and patient energy with which he so steadily adhered to, and so thoroughly carried out, the great mistake of his childhood, and the difficult task which he had at first undertaken under false impressions of duty.*

But we must not suppose that Cotton Mather was not conscious of the fault we are considering, or that he did not struggle against it. His diary affords abundant evidence

* His son computed the number of his father's fasts at not less than four hundred and fifty. He always spent a day in fasting once a month, and generally one or two in a week. In these, he strove to see and *feel* all his sins, and to come very near to God in holy contemplation and fervent prayer.

I have alluded to his exact methods of devotion and duty. He endeavored literally to fulfil the apostolic injunction, "Whether we eat or drink, or whatever we do," let us "do all to the glory of God." He strove to connect a religious meaning with every thing he saw or heard or did, and to derive from all religious improvement. His plans and devices for this purpose were numberless. He was extravagant, but sincere, in these contrivances. His purpose was good, but he carried it to extremes. He was constantly spurring himself to devout thought and religious duty. He would not allow the least relaxation to his self-scrutiny and discipline. He was every hour setting to himself some new task of piety. Illustrations of these peculiarities might be multiplied almost without end. Two or three, however, will suffice:—

"I durst not let my mind lie fallow as I walk the streets. I rebuke myself with heavy complaints, if I have gone many steps without a struggle to pull down thoughts of my Saviour into my soul. I compel the *signs in the streets* to point me unto something in my Saviour that should be thought upon. When I am at a loss for fresh thoughts of him, it is but casting my eye on the *shops* of either side; and from the *varieties in them* I have something in my Saviour suggested to me." When he knocked at a door, his faith was quickened towards his Saviour's promise, "Knock, and it shall be opened to you." When he paired his nails, he thought how he might "lay aside all superfluity of naughtiness." If a man passed, and did not notice him, he would pray, that God would help him "to take due notice of Christ."—*Et cetera.*

to the contrary. One of the first entries in it, after his leaving college, records his "apprehension of a cursed pride," working in his heart, that filled him with inexpressible bitterness and confusion before the Lord. "I resolved, therefore," he continues, "that I would set apart a day to humble myself before God for the pride of my own heart, and to entreat that by his grace I may be delivered from that sin. On examining myself, I found that proud thoughts fly-blown my best performances, and also an *ambitious affectation of pre-eminence* far above what could belong to my age or worth, and above others that were far more deserving than myself." Having then proceeded to consider the folly and wickedness of pride, and to set before himself strongly the absurdity of his glorying in himself, in whom God saw so many weaknesses and sins, he asks, "But what shall I do for the cure of this disease? In the first and chief place, I would carry my distempered heart unto the Lord Jesus, and put it into the hands of that all-sufficient Physician, for HIM to cure it. Secondly, I would be daily watchful against my pride, and continually keep an eye upon my heart, and check the least beginnings and first motion of this corruption." He concludes all with a prayer for help from above, in which he says, "I am laboring and heavy laden; but Christ bids me *come*: he calls for my heart. But what *kind* of a heart? He does not say; but I am sure he calls for *mine*. Hence, though my heart be a proud heart, yet, as long as it is mine, I am to bring it. And, O Lord! I bring it *because it is proud*. O Lord! take it, and make it humble. Though *I* cannot overcome this pride, *he* can. Oh! let him do it; I wait upon him for it."

Such struggles against his weaknesses, and such earnest prayers for divine help to overcome them, are continually revealed in his diary, and ought to be distinctly and honorably mentioned whenever his infirmities are spoken of.

Another fault quite evident in Cotton Mather is *irritability*. He was by nature sensitive: his temperament was nervous, and he was constitutionally restless. His feelings were quick, and he expressed himself strongly. But that his anger was any more inflammable, or explosive, or sharp in report, than is commonly the case with impulsive, ardent, and intensely active men, there is no good reason to believe. Besides, he met with a great deal to vex him, and try his temper. His great activity; his manifold writings on almost every subject; his multiplied engagements of a public nature; his controversies; his theological, ecclesiastical, and political opinions, openly and strongly declared; all these together kept him in such forwardness before the world, and brought him into contact with the prejudices of men at so many points, that he was constantly exposed to enmity and attack. He himself says, with some humor, "I have, first and last, had such a number of pamphlets thrown at me, that, if I had been vulnerable, I might appear stuck as full of darts as the *man in the signs of the almanack*." It should be remembered also, in this connection, that he had over his adversaries the doubtful advantage of a more abundant vocabulary, and a readiness and fluency of speech almost unequalled. Two bitter epithets for their one was no more than his fair proportion, considering his more copious furniture of words, and ought perhaps to be taken as the measure of only an equal wrath.

But what is more to the purpose is this: If it can be proved as clearly, that any of his assailants were half as sorry for their anger and invective as he was for his own, or prayed more earnestly for a forgiving spirit and the control of the tongue, though their offence were even greater than his, they shall be judged with as merciful a judgment. Again and again we find him humbling himself before God, when he had been betrayed into the indulgence of angry emotion or hasty speech, and praying for strength to overcome this propensity. Again and again we read in his private papers "Resolutions against speaking evil of any man. I will keep a charity for the person of whom I am *forced* to speak harshly, wishing most heartily that all *good* might rather be spoken of him. I will watch my heart, and never utter hard things with delight, but with brevity and aversion. If I know any good that can be said, I will balance the bad with the mention of it. I will first speak *to* the person, if I can; at all events, I will speak nothing of him but what I would be content to say to his face." Again and again we find prayers for the forgiveness of his enemies, and for a blessing upon those who had maligned him.

A single paragraph, illustrative of the sincerity of such prayers, is all that I have space to transcribe. It is hardly necessary to say, that it was not written with the expectation of its ever being seen by any eye but his own. Let any man read it, and judge whether the instantaneous association of kind wishes for those who had wronged him, with the first rush of joyous emotion at the sense of God's mercy to himself, is not a beautiful evidence of a heart

essentially generous and forgiving:—"This day, having humbled myself, and judged myself before the Lord, for my many offences, the Spirit of the Most High brought me to a marvellous temper, which was to me like the very suburbs of heaven, through the joy he gave me that my sins were forgiven through the pardoning mercy of God in Jesus Christ. Immediately, I called to mind the names of all the persons whom I remembered to have reproached and injured me, and most heartily begged the God of heaven on their behalf, one by one, that they might be blessed with all the blessings of goodness."

Among the faults which have been attributed to Cotton Mather, are bigotry and intolerance. To the full extent which justice warrants, let their stain rest upon his character,—but no further. That he was a strict Calvinist and a zealous Congregationalist; that he maintained the theological doctrines which he believed, and the ecclesiastical order he loved, with vigor and warmth; that in the heat of polemics he was sometimes sharp and uncivil; that in attacking errors which he deemed baneful, or repelling unjust accusations against his father or himself, he was at times sarcastic, and even vituperative,—are facts which the most friendly biographer would not attempt to deny. And yet in principle, and generally in feeling, however incompatible the two statements may seem, he was more liberal and tolerant in regard to religious opinions and sects than the majority of divines of his own day and school. It would be difficult to find in any contemporary writings such repeated and strong avowals of dislike to bigotry, and hatred of persecution for conscience' sake, or such just

and enlarged sentiments with regard to toleration, as his own.

“I adhere,” he says, “to the Sacred Scriptures as the sufficient rule for belief and worship and manners among the people of God; and I would maintain a brotherly fellowship with all good men, in the things wherein I apprehend them to follow these divine directions.” I quote from the “*Manductio ad Ministerium*,” a work written for the direction of students for the ministry, containing many valuable counsels, and displaying the author’s usual learning and ability. In the same book, he says, “Let the table of the Lord have no rails about it, that shall hinder a godly Independent, Presbyterian, Episcopalian, Antipædobaptist, or Lutheran, from sitting down together there. Corinthian brass would not be so bright a composition as the people of God in such a coalition, feasting together on his holy mountain. Insist upon it, that no terms shall be imposed but such *necessary things* as Heaven will require of all; that all who fear God and work righteousness, all whom Christ receives to the kingdom of God, shall be received and acknowledged by Christians as brethren.” “’Tis even the first-born of my wishes,” he says to the young minister, “that you may be one of those angels that shall fly through the midst of heaven with the everlasting gospel, to preach it unto them who dwell upon the earth, and move all the people of God, though of different persuasions in *lesser points*, to embrace one another upon the *generous maxims* of it, and keep lesser points in a due subordination unto the superior maxims, and manage their differences upon these lesser points with another spirit than that which

disputers of this world, in the several sects of Christians, keep commonly cutting one another withal." And to move and encourage those to whom he writes to this liberal course, he utters a grand prophecy in this strong paragraph: "There are concurring with you hundreds of thousands of generous minds, in which this feeling now lies shut up as an *aurum fulminans*; but it will break forth more and more as the day approaches, and as men improve in *manly religion*, in explosions that will carry all before it; and the mean, little, narrow souls that know no religion but that of a party and of their secular interests, will become deserted objects, for the pity or disdain of those who have taken the way that is above them." These expressions certainly do honor to his liberality. The practice of his own church, with regard to Christian intercourse, was, by his advice, conformable to these enlarged principles; and no one who reads the exulting language in which he expresses his delight at the absence of a sectarian spirit in the churches of Boston can for a moment doubt his sincerity: "In this capital city of Boston, there are ten assemblies of Christians of different persuasions, who live so lovingly and peaceably together, doing all the offices of friendship for one another in so neighborly a manner, as may give a sensible rebuke to all the bigots of uniformity, and show them how consistent a variety of rites in religion may be with the tranquillity of human society; and may demonstrate to the world that persecution for conscientious dissent in religion is an abomination of desolation, a thing whereof all wise and just men will say, 'Cursed be its anger!'"

Even towards the Quakers, whom he seems to have

particularly disliked, he declares his desire that "all imaginable civility should be extended, and that the civil magistrate should not inflict the damage of a farthing for their consciences." It is true that he himself did not, in his own treatment of them, act up to his principles. He dealt with them very severely in his writings; for he utterly abominated their doctrines, and dreaded the tendency of them, as alike dangerous to the church and the state. He probably considered it perfectly fair, as well as a duty, to oppose them with all his might, and hold their opinions and practices up to ridicule in his books, so long as he left them unharmed in person; and doubtless made in his own mind a broader distinction than would now be considered justifiable between verbal and legal persecution. And it ought to be said further, that he grounds his severity against the Quakers as much, or more, upon specimens of their political contumely and obstinacy, and the immoralities of some of their number, which he traced to the looseness of their religious notions, than upon their doctrines alone.

The greatest blot upon the character of Cotton Mather, in the general opinion, is his conduct in relation to the "Salem Witchcraft." He is charged, not only with having been the chief agent in kindling the fierce excitement of the public mind on that subject, but with having instigated and encouraged the barbarities in which it expended itself. The worst motives, moreover, have been attributed to him for the part he acted. He has been accused of having fanned the terrific flame, for the gratification of personal ambition or professional vanity; with having been willing

to risk all the bloody results of the persecution, for the chance of restoring the political power of the clergy, which was fast slipping out of their hands; and with odious hypocrisy, in pretending implicit faith in the supposed cases of demoniacal possession, and a religious indignation against the witches, in order to inflame the passion of the populace, and influence the decision of the courts for the furtherance of his deep schemes.

That he was one of the principal actors in this tragedy is evident. That his writings upon the wonders of the invisible world, and the stand he early took, had some influence upon public sentiment, is quite probable. But that he was really actuated by the motives alleged against him is an accusation that would require more proof to substantiate it than has ever yet been brought together. However credulous, however ambitious, Cotton Mather was not artful nor hypocritical. No one who is intimate with his history will be ready to suspect him of these vices. No one who searches his nature most thoroughly will find them amongst his faults; at least, not in a degree adequate to the given result. He often deceived himself; but he was not adroit enough in cunning to deceive others. The very conceit that prevented him from clearly seeing his own faults prevented him also from attempting to hide them from others. He was too ardent and demonstrative for a hypocrite; too restless and garrulous, too impulsive and erratic, for a conspirator. His mind was too full of thoughts, notions, and fancies, ever crowding and chasing one another, and all straining after the light in word or deed, to hatch or brood in the dark a *single* dangerous

purpose. He may be called a fool for his credulity; but he certainly cannot be called a knave for his cunning.

His first publication on the subject of witchcraft was in 1685, the year in which he was ordained, and several years before the great excitement and the Salem trials. The very date of this work is evidence enough of two facts, important to a right judgment of his case: first, that his belief in witchcraft was early deeply rooted in his mind, and sustained by the scriptural and historical testimony referred to in that book; and, secondly, that he did not get up a fury in himself for the occasion when the time was ripe for the Salem tragedy, but had actually called public attention to the subject, because of his opinion of its intrinsic interest, long before the period when it is supposed the plan was formed to excite the people for his own importance or for the political interests of the clergy.

There is no doubt that he was passionately fond of the marvellous. From his early life, he had meditated much upon the "angelical ministry," both good and bad, and was a firm believer in it. He supposed that spirits were all around man's path, and ever active. He attributed temptations and wicked thoughts to the agency of the evil angels; and traced back to God, pure suggestions, holy impulses, and choice blessings, dispensed through the kind ministrations of the good. To "please the angels" was one of his daily motives; to be in sympathy with them, an object of frequent endeavor; to be like them, and fitted for their communion, his constant prayer. He studied, as he said, with all the thought and learning he could master, the existence, properties, and relations of the angels, and

the honor due to them by men, especially to the "benign angels." He made himself familiar with every declaration and hint of Scripture, as to their ministry towards children or particular saints, or the church in general. He made catalogues of his mercies from heaven, and compared them with those attributed in the Bible to their agency. He found many instances in which the similarity was sufficient to encourage him to suppose he also had felt their kindness. And, when he thought of these things, his soul would overflow with rapturous praises; "and in the midst of them," he writes, "I could not forbear saying, 'If any good angels of the Lord are now by me, do you also bless the Lord, ye heavenly ministers! and, oh! adore that free grace of his which employs you to be serviceable to so poor, so mean, so vile a wretch as is here prostrate before him.'" *

* A few other sentences, from those which are scattered through his private papers, may not be uninteresting in this connection:—

"Have I, to animate myself unto holiness in all manner of conversation, in my contemplations often endeavored to affect myself with the *holiness of the purified spirits* in the paradise of God; their flaming devotions; their delight in God; their hatred of sin; the contempt with which they look down on the high things of this world; and the goodness with which they treat one another?—done this with earnest desires to be as like them as this mortal state may attain to and will admit of?

"Have I frequently thought, with what a zeal of the Lord of hosts angels do burn; how they are upon the wing to execute the commands of our Lord; with what pure eyes of detestation they behold evil, and look upon iniquity; with what pleasure they do good offices for the heirs of salvation? and have I wished and longed, oh that I were, as far as my capacity would allow of it, like unto those holy ones?" "Have I thought what returns I should make for the benefits I have received by God's angels?"

"Have I, because I have thought it would be a *little* angelical, taken a list of many poor people, with some care to have their necessities relieved against the approaching winter?"

The evil angels, on the other hand, were as much objects of hatred and dread as the good were of honor and love. He watched against their machinations; he strove to resist them; he prayed to be delivered from their power.

Few of his own age probably had such a strong and lively faith in the "angelical ministry," and fewer still made such practical use of their belief. We can easily imagine that such a man should have been a firm believer in demoniacal possession and witchcraft, especially in an age when the almost universal faith of the Christian world was on his side, when the wisest men and the ablest jurists gave him their sanction. We wonder now at the credulity of our ancestors, and deem it well nigh impossible that such a delusion should have held such wide and deep dominion over intelligent minds, so short a time ago. But we should remember that it was nearly half a century later than the date of the Salem trials before the English statute which made witchcraft a capital offence was repealed.* And more, I think, than half a century later, Sir William Blackstone declared "that to deny the actual existance of witchcraft and sorcery is at once flatly to contradict the revealed word of God and the testimony of every nation in the world."

There can be no difficulty, then, in accounting for Cotton Mather's exceeding interest in the cases of supposed witchcraft which were occurring in his neighborhood, and in the process of the trials at Salem, without attributing to him any sinister design or any cruel purpose. It was precisely the subject that, above all others, would excite his

* A.D. 1736.

curiosity, and engage his most earnest attention. It may be no credit to him that he so rioted in the marvellous; but that such was his taste and his propensity is reason enough for his having been so prominent and busy in this baneful delusion.

But it is constantly hinted, if not directly asserted, that *guilt* attaches to Cotton Mather,—the terrible guilt of the sacrifice of innocent persons, who, on insufficient evidence, were condemned and put to death. The stain of their blood, in the view of some, is upon him. He pushed on the courts, it is said, to a murderous judgment. Our just and natural horror, as we read the history of this awful tragedy, causes a feeling of indignation to spring up against all who were instrumental in it. We are filled with pity, as we ought to be, for the victims, and with disgust at the executioners. But emotions like these, however honorable to our hearts, ought not to be allowed to unfit our minds for a calm and sober judgment. Compassion ceases to be a virtue when it stands in the way of justice. Our sympathies have been so strongly excited towards the one side, that we have not, I think, been entirely just to the other. Several innocent persons were actually hung as witches; therefore the judges were weak and sanguinary men, those who countenanced them were as unworthy and cruel as themselves, and Massachusetts herself must wear an indelible stain. Such seems to be the reasoning which by common consent we have adopted; such the conclusion into which we seem disposed to settle down. But, though it goes against my heart even to appear to turn one impulse of pity from the sufferers, I must ask you to

look for one moment with composure at the other side. An alarming excitement was prevailing in Salem and its vicinity. A large and continually increasing number of people complained that they were preternaturally vexed and tortured. They exhibited all the marks of real suffering. They kept the town in disturbance by their strange actions and sudden outcries. They insisted that their tormentors were spectres, exactly resembling certain living men and women, whom they described. They declared that these spectral tormentors tendered them a book, in the devil's name, to sign or touch, in token of allegiance; and, if they refused, redoubled their tortures. So great became the agitation and disorder, so importunate the outcries of the victims, so manifold their apparent sufferings, and so reiterated their charges against the individuals whom the spectres personated, that the magistrates were compelled to take cognizance of the matter. They must do something to put a stop to these alarming evils. They proceeded to an investigation. The afflicted, being examined, testified to the reality of their calamities. Being confronted with the persons whom they accused, they would immediately swoon, or fall into convulsions, from which the touch of no other hands than those of the accused themselves could restore them; but, when touched by them, they immediately revived. Moreover, as if under the influence of a mysterious fascination or sympathy, they would imitate all the motions of the accused, and obey their gestures, though apparently too distant to observe them. The magistrates were puzzled. The whole country was in confusion. The General Court was able to transact little

business, and adjourned, on account of the commotion, from the second day of July to the second Wednesday in October. A general panic seized all classes. The wisest men in the country were at first carried away with the excitement. They all believed in witchcraft and commerce with the devil, even those who afterwards wrote most strongly against the hard things done in the trials; and they thought that the present were cases of real possession. They all, too, felt the necessity of vigorous measures of some kind, to relieve the country, if possible, from the sore calamity that had fallen upon it. What shall be done? The seven judges* tried and condemned one,—who was executed,—and then hesitated. The cases multiplied. The jails were overflowing with the accused. “What shall be done?” was the question that passed from mouth to mouth. At this stage, Cotton Mather made a proposal far more characteristic of him than ambition or cruelty. He offered, *that, if the possessed people who were under accusation might be scattered far asunder, he would singly provide for six of them, and see whether, without more bitter methods, prayer with fasting would not put an end to these heavy trials.* This offer was refused, as we might suppose; for all men had not the same faith as our pastor in those remedies. But that he was in earnest in his offer is evident, not only from the general tone of his opinions and practice, but also from the fact that he himself, during the witchcraft trials, spent a day almost every week in secret fasting and prayer.

* Lieut.-Governor Stoughton, Major Saltonstall, Major Richards, Major Gedney, Mr. Wait Winthrop, Capt. Sewall, and Mr. Sargeant.

But the matter was now in the courts; and through the courts it must go, and by the courts be decided. Only, before proceeding further, the Governor and Council, according to "an old charter-practice," asked the advice of the clergy of Boston. A paper, containing eight articles of advice, was drawn up by them, the author of which was Cotton Mather. It has been objected against, but, I think, without reason. It is a document not dishonorable to the ministers. If Cotton Mather's true sentiments are to be judged of by it, his most partial advocate could ask for no better vindication. It recommends "a very critical and exquisite caution" in the conduct of the prosecution. It urges that all proceedings be managed with "an exceeding tenderness to the accused." It suggests, that, in the examinations, "as little noise, company, and openness as possible" should be allowed; and that no tests of doubtful lawfulness be employed. It is true, that in a single section it recommends "the speedy and vigorous prosecutions of such as have rendered themselves obnoxious, *according to the directions given in the laws of God, and the wholesome statutes of the English nation.*" But is this an offence against humanity, justice, and religion? As good citizens; as friends of law; as men who honored the word of God, and would uphold the wholesome statutes* of their country; as those who would not flinch from a duty because it was painful, or have the judges quail before the severity of the law they were bound under oath to enforce;

* At the first trial, the statute of James the First was in force. Before the second, the Old Colony law, making witchcraft a capital crime, was revived.

and as men, moreover, who believed that commerce with the devil was one of the worst of crimes, — what less could they have advised? “They imagined the prince of hell, with his legions, to be among them, the Lord’s host, seeking among them whom he might devour; and they would give place to him for subjection, — no, not for an hour. Set upon by invisible and supernatural foes, they thought of nothing but prompt defiance, inflexible resistance, and the victory which God would give his people. They would have made bare the arm of flesh against the serpent in bodily presence, could he have put on an assailable shape: as it was, they let it fall without mercy on those whom they understood to be his emissaries.”* They were true Massachusetts men and ministers; and, “whatever opinions upon facts or duties Massachusetts has held, her habit has been, whether for good or ill, to follow them with vigorous action.”†

* See Dr. Palfrey’s admirable Semi-centennial Discourse before the Massachusetts Historical Society.

† Hutchinson says, “The court justified themselves from books of law, and the authorities of Keble, Dalton, and other lawyers, then of the first character, who lay down rules of conviction as absurd and dangerous as any which were practised in New England. Reproach for hanging witches, although it has been often cast upon the people of New England by those of Old, yet it must have been done with an ill grace. The people of New England were of a grave cast, and had long been disposed to give a serious, solemn construction even to common events in Providence; but in Old England the reign of Charles II. was as remarkable for gaiety as any whatsoever, and for scepticism and infidelity as any which preceded it. . . . In Scotland, seven were executed for witches, in 1697, upon the testimony of one girl, about eleven years old. . . . More witches have been put to death in a single county in England, in a short space of time, than have ever suffered in New England, altogether, from first to last.” — *History of Massachusetts*, vol. ii. chap. 1.

It was no fault of the clergy, as Hutchinson suggests, that the magistrates paid more regard to the last article than to all that preceded it, and chose to carry on the prosecutions with "all possible vigor," to the neglect of "the exquisite caution and excessive tenderness" which had been so earnestly recommended.

If the trials had been conducted according to the advices of the ministers: if all presumptive and spectral evidence, all tests of doubtful lawfulness, all "testimonies whose force and strength is from the devils alone," had been rejected; if all the "cautions, restrictions, and qualifications" recommended by the clergy had been properly regarded, "the judges might have proceeded as vigorously as they pleased; the more vigorously the better, for by this means the jails had been the sooner emptied, and the accused persons set at liberty." *

* "From persons who believed in the reality of witchcraft, and that the proper witch is deserving of death, as all these ministers most seriously did, — I see not how better advice than that which they proffered to the magistrates on this occasion could reasonably have been expected. And happy had it been for all concerned, if the judges had been content to follow it. But they would not. At least, some of them would not, particularly Chief Justice Stoughton. He seems to have been fully satisfied, at least for a time, as to the validity of the 'spectral evidence,' and other branches of the devil's testimony; and consequently the work of hanging went on." — *Pond's Life of Sir William Phipps*.

Hutchinson says that it was not long before one of the judges [Sewall] was sensible of his error. At a public fast, he gave the minister a note, acknowledging his error in the late proceedings, and desiring to humble himself in the sight of God and his people. But Chief Justice Stoughton, being informed of this act of one of his associates, said, for *himself*, when he sat in judgment he had the fear of God before his eyes, and gave his opinion according to the best of his understanding; and although it might appear afterwards that he had been in an error, yet he saw no necessity of a public acknowledgment of it.

But the judges were carried away captive, for the time, through the power of a terrible delusion. Superstition got the better of their reason and their humanity. The blindness of their fanaticism was impenetrable by the light of truth. The cry of justice could not make itself heard amidst the confusion and clamor of fear; and mercy failed to render her thrills perceptible in hearts that were shivering with superstitious awe. That Cotton Mather was enchanted in the same spell with the other prominent actors in these tragic events; that he was credulous to a ridiculous extreme; that he was inordinately fond of the marvellous; that he was too easily imposed upon; that his intense and undisguised interest in every case of alleged possession betrayed him into indiscretions, and laid him open to censure; and that he busied himself unnecessarily with the trials,—are facts which rest upon indubitable evidence, are blemishes which can never be wiped away from his name. But no deeper stigma than these facts affix can be justly fastened upon his character. That he was under the influence of any bad motives, any sanguinary feelings; that he did not verily think he was doing God service, and the devil injury; that he would not gladly have prevented the disorderly proceedings of the courts, the application of unlawful tests, and every thing unmerciful in the trials, and inhuman in their issue,—the most careful examination has failed to make me believe.

In admitting so much as I have unfavorable to Cotton Mather, in relation to the witchcraft-madness, it has been my endeavor to do ample justice to the statements and opinions of his enemies. If there has been an error in

making up the judgment I have ventured to express, it is in not having allowed sufficient weight to the vindications of his conduct furnished by his friends and himself. I am sensible that a better case might be made out by one who should undertake to defend him. This I have wished studiously to avoid. I will only add, in dismissing this topic, that every one who carefully examines the whole evidence will find a perplexity which never can be wholly cleared up. At one moment, his character appears in a favorable light; at another, under the shade. In some points, his conduct impresses us with respect; in others, with disapprobation. Here, we find him taking a stand for humanity and justice; and there, apparently countenancing the errors of the judges, and defending their decisions. Now, he expresses sentiments worthy of a wise man; and anon, unless we reject the testimony of Calef, he speaks and acts more like one infatuated. There was, doubtless, an inconsistency in his own feelings; and therefore there must be in our verdict. His mind was *pendulous*. Though attached, at its highest point of desire and purpose, to eternal justice, it was ever oscillating over a wide scale of notions and impulses. If he was a riddle to himself, there is no wonder that he should appear so to us.

The great defect of Cotton Mather's character was the want of steadiness, to which allusion has just been made, combined with a lack of judgment. If he could have possessed these two qualities, he would have been one of the greatest and most influential of men, as he is one of the most remarkable.

Taken out of his own age, and judged by the standard

of another, his character is precisely such as is likely to be under-estimated. His contemporaries, with all his imperfections, regarded him generally with admiration and respect, though he had enemies enough to expose all his faults. The judgment passed upon him by the best men of his times, who knew him thoroughly, and were competent to estimate him, is safe in the keeping of history. The verdict of posterity may not have fully agreed with theirs; but theirs stands recorded in terms distinct and unequivocal, above the power of time or enmity to obliterate or alter. It accords to him "extraordinary intellectual capacity, readiness of wit, vastness of reading, strength of memory, treasures of learning, uncommon activity, unwearied application, extensive zeal, and splendor of virtue, through the abundant grace of God." It asserts that "*to do all the good he could to all*, was his maxim, his study, his labor, his pleasure." It represents him, in spite of his singular style, as "an impressive and effective preacher; of so much warmth and zeal, so much earnestness and sincerity, with spirits so raised and all on fire in the pulpit, and such evident and pious longing to do good, that his faults disappeared in his excellences;" and it declares, that he was mourned at his death "as the first minister in Boston; the first in age, in gifts, and in grace; the first in all the provinces of New England for universal literature and extensive services." *

* Colman, Prince, Gee, and others. I cannot believe that the description given of him by good men is so unlike the original as to involve absurdity, as well as falsehood. Mr. Gee says, "He was bright among the excellent of the earth. The whole land has lost a very considerable part of its strength and glory. Truth and justice have lost a champion who was

The ministry of Cotton Mather ran parallel with that of his father, from the time of his settlement as colleague, May 13, 1685, till the death of the latter, Aug. 23, 1723, — a period of thirty-nine years. He survived his father till February 13, 1728, — only four years and a half; having been pastor of this church forty-four years. During this period, the society enjoyed uninterrupted prosperity, the congregation was very numerous, and multitudes were added to the church. If an eminently successful ministry, a crowded audience, the strong and unabated attachment

able to defend and maintain them. Learning hath lost an eminent patron, who was ever ready to promote it. The churches have lost a pastor who was a pillar in the house of his God. It would be difficult to find his equal among men of like passions with us. He was pious without pretence, serious without moroseness, grave but not austere, affable without meanness, and facetious without levity. He was peaceable in his temper, but zealous against sin. He was catholic in his charity, abundant in his liberality, and obliging to strangers, *though often ill requited.*" He speaks most plainly of his *revilers*, and rebukes them boldly and sharply. He calls them "*that herd of abandoned mortals whose sport it has been to reek their venom upon a faithful servant of God, in profane and ungodly scorn and derision;*" and then, turning his discourse to them, he bids them "mourn for the hardness of their hearts, and repent and bewail their abuse." Mr. Gee would not have dared to have thus challenged and rebuked his accusers, unless he knew well that they deserved it, and felt confident that Cotton Mather had been injured. I think that we are bound, after reading such words as these, not to attach too much weight to the statements of those who were hostile to our minister.

I have not spoken particularly of Cotton Mather's writings, and have necessarily left many facts of his history untouched. He published three hundred and eighty-two books, and left others in manuscript. Of the latter, the most important and ponderous is a work on which he was employed for about twenty years, — *Biblia Americana*, — illustrative of the Old and New Testaments. It is in the library of the Massachusetts Historical Society. Proposals were issued for its publication, in three volumes, folio, after his death; but sufficient encouragement could not be obtained. It is a work of immense learning and labor.

For further notice of his writings, style, &c. see APPENDIX E.

of a large congregation, the steady enlargement of a church, benevolent activity,* and a general and constant improvement of the ordinances on the part of a people, are any proofs of piety, ability, and faithfulness in a religious teacher, or give him any claim to respect, — the name of Mather richly deserves to be mentioned with reverence in the church with whose best days it is associated, and whose history it has made illustrious.

Cotton Mather was alone in the care of the church, only four months after the death of his father. Joshua Gee, a son of the Second Church, educated under the care of its venerable minister, and one after his own heart, was chosen to be his colleague, and ordained, Dec. 18, 1723. Mr. Gee was graduated at Harvard College in 1717, and was regarded as a young man of unusual promise. Before receiving the call of this church, he had attracted some notice, and been invited to settle in Portsmouth, N.H. His talents were of a high order, and qualified him to exert a commanding influence. All who have spoken of him bear testimony to his powerful intellect, his profound learning, and his extraordinary ability as a logician. Though not calculated to win popularity, he could easily command respect by the force of his arguments, the weight of his

* Some idea of the number and variety of the charitable operations to which Cotton Mather prompted his parishioners may be formed from the frequency and amount of contributions. Mr. Ware has noticed the following in one year: £62, for redeeming captives from the Indians; £53, for redeeming two persons from Turkish captivity; £80, for relieving three young men from the same; £44, for relief of poor inhabitants of frontier towns in the East; £53, on Fast-day, for the poor; and £60, at Thanksgiving, for propagating the gospel.

thoughts, and a certain natural superiority which appears to have impressed itself upon all who came in contact with him. It is said, "that he was capable of rising to any height of excellence; but, unhappily, he was of an indolent habit, which prevented him from making that use of his advantages which would have secured to him the ascendancy for which he seems to have been formed." He was a high Calvinist, and full of zeal, not always tempered by charity or controlled by discretion. He took a leading part in the theological controversies of his day. "He was an earnest promoter of the religious excitement which prevailed throughout the country after Whitfield's first visit; and refused to open his eyes to the evils which attended it, even after many of its friends had become convinced of their existence." His great fondness for "revivals" led him to multiply prayer-meetings in his own church, and involved him, with others, in a serious contention with a majority of the congregational clergy of Massachusetts. At the annual meeting of the Convention, in Boston, in 1743, that body felt called upon to take notice of the extensive disorders which had grown out of the religious excitement above alluded to, and published a "Testimony against several errors of doctrine and evils of practice which have of late obtained in various parts of the land." Mr. Gee replied to this in a letter to Rev. Nathaniel Eells, Moderator of the Convention; complaining of the false impression the pamphlet was likely to produce as to the state of the churches, and that no testimony had been allowed in favor of revivals; and calling another meeting of ministers, for the day succeeding the Commence-

ment at Cambridge, then held in July. The proposed meeting took place, and prepared another "Testimony to the Churches," giving a favorable representation of the late revivals; but acknowledging the evils and dangers that attended them, and warning the churches against them, as well as against "itinerancy, and the intruding into parishes without the consent of their ministers." To this document were affixed the signatures of sixty-eight ministers, together with the separate testimonies of forty-three others, added in appendix; making the whole number of names one hundred and eleven. "Gee's attack upon the Convention was answered very satisfactorily by Mr. Prescott, of Salem, and Mr. Hancock, of Braintree; who make it evident that he wrote in great hastiness of temper, and under the influence of what he regarded a personal affront. They prove several of his statements to be incorrect, and completely defend the doings of the Convention. Dr. Chauncy, who had been personally assailed by Mr. Gee, defended himself in a letter published in the 'Boston Evening Post' of June 24; and Mr. Gee, according to Mr. Hancock, retracted.

"Another meeting of the 'Assembly' was held in September, 1745; when a further defence was attempted of the religious excitements of the country. This second 'Testimony' was signed by Prince, Webb, and Gee, of Boston, and twenty-one others. There were also published, in this feverish season, two 'Testimonies' of laymen, against the prevalent evils of the churches." *

* Note to Mr. Ware's Historical Sermon.

The remark of Dr. Chauncy has been often quoted, with reference to Mr. Gee: "It was happy Mr. Gee had an indolent turn; for, with such fiery zeal and such talents, he would have made continual confusion in the churches." It is also said of him, that he enjoyed, more than any thing else, to sit down and talk with his friends, and talked admirably well. His power seemed to show itself best when there was no call for exertion; for he rather shrunk from working; though, when he set about it, he could accomplish as much as any man. This combination of ardent, even rash zeal, and great natural force, with an indisposition to exertion, is sometimes met with; though it would appear, at first thought, to be unnatural and inconsistent.

It is evident, from repeated votes and other expressions in the church-books, that there was a very strong attachment felt for Mr. Gee by his parishioners. They seem to have been quite generous in their pecuniary bestowments; not only, from time to time, increasing by small sums his salary, which was paid weekly, but adding to his allowance for rent and for fuel, and making presents of considerable value from the "church-stock." * His health appears not to have been good, as early as 1731; at which time he asks

* Such votes as the following are of not infrequent occurrence:—
"18 Nov. 1729. Voted, that, in consideration of the dearth of all necessaries of life, there be a present of sixty pounds now made to the Rev. Joshua Gee, our pastor, out of the money in the church's stock. Also voted, that an addition of five shillings per week be made to Mr. Gee's salary, so as to make it up four pounds ten shillings per week. Also voted, that an addition of ten pounds be made to the thirty pounds formerly allowed to provide Mr. Gee with firewood, for the year current, beginning the first of

to have assistance in administering the communion when he may be feeble, and to have measures taken for the supply of the pulpit. It is possible that the indolence with which he is charged may have been in part the lassitude arising from physical weakness, for which every one who has experienced it, and struggled against it, will be willing to make liberal allowance. The church readily assented to his proposal for assistance. They voted to choose three persons, to preach in succession, each of them four weeks, evidently with a view to the choice of a colleague. From this time forward, I judge that Mr. Gee preached but a comparatively small part of the time. The three persons first selected were Samuel Mather, Daniel Rogers, and Mather Byles.* As soon as they had completed their engagement, it was again agreed to choose two, to preach in turn four sabbaths apiece. This time, the choice fell upon Stephen Sewall and Samuel Mather. When *they* had finished, the church voted to appoint "the Tuesday following the eighth Lord's day to come to be observed as a day of fasting and prayer, to implore the gracious presence of the great Head of the Church to guide them in the choice of a pastor; and the Friday following said

May last. [N.B. Drawn up by the Hon. Adam Winthrop, Esq. in the pastor's absence.]"

His salary was afterwards increased to eight pounds a week; and, when he was alone in the care of the church, three pounds were allowed him weekly, to supply his pulpit, as he might feel it to be necessary for his relief.

* Grandson of Increase Mather, by whom he was greatly beloved. See Increase Mather's will, in Appendix. He was a member of the Second Church, and by vote, Dec. 10, 1732, was "dismissed to the new church, in Hollis-street, that he might be ordained its pastor."

Tuesday, for a meeting to proceed to the choice." In the meantime, they agreed to divide the intervening sabbaths between Samuel Mather and Mather Byles. On the appointed day, Jan. 28, 1732, Samuel Mather was chosen by sixty-nine votes out of one hundred and twelve.

His ordination as colleague took place the twenty-first of the following June, about four years after his father's death. "He was recommended to the church, not only by their respect for the ancient family, but by his own character for diligence, zeal, and learning, of which he certainly possessed an uncommon share. He had already made himself known at home and abroad by several publications." After he had continued colleague-pastor for nine years, a serious difficulty arose between himself and a majority of the church, as well as between himself and Mr. Gee. The affair, as represented in church-papers which have been recently discovered, was not so creditable to Mr. Mather as we might desire. Regard to truth compels me to notice these records; though I would prefer to cast a deep veil over the whole matter. There is nothing in the whole history that leaves a stain upon the memory of Mr. Gee.

It appears that many of the church, together with Mr. Gee, were dissatisfied with Mr. Mather, partly on account of what they considered the looseness of his doctrines, and partly on account of suspicions and charges of impropriety of conduct which were current against him. Mr. Mather, on finding that such a state of things existed, asked a dismission. The church refused to grant it, and proceeded to an investigation of the charges. Not being able to

agree as to the truth of the accusations, or to bring about any satisfactory issue, they called in the aid of an ecclesiastical council. The churches invited to form the council were the Rev. Dr. Colman's, Dr. Sewall's, Mr. Webb's, Mr. Foxcroft's, and Mr. Cheekley's. So far as can be ascertained from various sources, — for the matter is not clearly stated on the church-records, — the council held two meetings. The result of the first was a letter of advice to the church, on one part, and Mr. Mather, on the other, as to their several duties till the time to which the council adjourned; perhaps with the hope, that, before the adjourned meeting, the difficulty might be healed. The tenor of this advice may be gathered from the agreement of both parties, as recorded on our books. The church vote, that, upon the supposition of the Rev. Mr. Mather's compliance with the advice given to *him*, *they* purpose, by the will of God, to comply with the advice given to them; that is, "to attend upon his ministry, and strive to effect a reconciliation, until the time to which the council is adjourned." Then the Rev. Mr. Mather gave in a declaration of his resolved endeavors for a compliance with the advice given to him by the said venerable council, in several articles, as follows:

"1. I shall endeavor, according to the advice given, to use all proper means to get my mind further enlightened and settled in the important points mentioned by the council, and to discover the same in preaching and conversation.

"2. I shall endeavor to be more frequent and distinct in preaching on the nature, and pressing the necessity, of regeneration by the Spirit of grace.

“3. I shall endeavor to beware of any thing in my sermons or conversation which may tend to discourage the work of conviction and conversion among us. I shall be cautious and watchful in this respect; and, in public and private, encourage the said good work of God.

“4. With respect to the grounds of fear and jealousy concerning me, I desire to judge and humble myself before the Lord, and would with condescension and meekness endeavor the minds of my brethren may be reconciled and healed, and for the future would walk before my brethren with the humility required in the gospel, and with becoming circumspection.

“Lastly, I resolve, by the Divine help, to comply with all the advice above mentioned.”

But this prospect of harmony was soon clouded. The church voted, that Mr. Mather had not satisfactorily performed his engagement to comply with the advice of the ministers. The adjourned meeting of the council was held. The church were advised to dismiss Mr. Mather, and to continue his salary for one year; the ministers very generously offering to *give* their services in preaching as often as they might be requested, in order to encourage and help the church to bear this pecuniary burden. Mr. Mather being dismissed, thirty men and sixty-three women, members of the church, who were his friends, withdrew with him; the number that remained with Mr. Gee being eighty men and one hundred and eighty-three women. The separated party, with Mr. Mather, afterwards sent a letter to the church, offering to return; or, if not allowed to do so, expressing their conscientious purpose to build

a new meeting-house. The church voted that their return, and the re-settlement of Mr. Mather, would not be consistent with the peace and edification of the church. Whereupon they proceeded immediately to erect a church in Hanover-street, at the corner of North Bennet, where the Universalist Church now stands. The fact that so many persons of good character supported Mr. Mather, and undertook the arduous and expensive work of building a new church to sustain him, would seem to afford good reason to doubt whether the charges of impropriety were well founded. From the period of his dismissal, Dec. 21, 1741, till his death, June 27, 1785, he continued to be the minister of a separate congregation, most of the members of which, at his decease, returned to the Second Church.


From the removal of Mr. Mather, Mr. Gee continued sole minister of the church till Sept. 3, 1747; at which date, Samuel Checkley was ordained as his assistant. The health of Mr. Gee, however, had long been declining; and, before a year had elapsed from the settlement of his colleague, the church was in mourning for his death, in the fifty-first year of his age, and the twenty-fifth of his ministry. While under his charge, the church sustained, in a great measure, the high position which it had acquired through the distinguished services of his predecessors. It was continually applied to for advice and assistance by other churches in their difficulties, and took a leading part in the ecclesiastical affairs of New England.

I ought not to forget to acknowledge an important obligation under which Mr. Gee has placed his successors, by laying the foundation of a church and pastor's library.

“Mr. Checkley was the son of an eminent minister of the New South Church, and is said to have been distinguished for a peculiar sort of eloquence, and an uncommon felicity in the devotional service of public worship. He published nothing except one sermon on the death of Mrs. Lydia Hutchinson, and left the records of the church so imperfect, that little can be learned from them of its state and fortunes during his connection with it. He died, after a ministry of twenty-one years, on the 19th of March, 1768.”* The character of his theological opinions may be understood from the vote passed by the church previous to his call, that the person whom they should elect “shall appear to the church to be a person of experimental piety, who embraces the doctrines of grace according to the gospel, and the Confession of Faith of the churches of New England, and the discipline of Congregational Churches, exhibited in our well-known platform, and the propositions concerning the consociation and communion of churches.”

It is worthy of notice, that, in May, 1760, the church unanimously voted, that it “was reasonable that the brethren of the congregation should unite with them in managing the temporal affairs of the society.” This is the first distinct recognition on our records of the right of the congregation to conjoint action with the church. The majority of the parish committee were to be selected from the church; namely, the deacons and five of the brethren; four only of the members being allowed to the congregation.

* Mr. Ware's Historical Sermon.



John Lathrop

THIRD PERIOD.

FROM THE ORDINATION OF DR. LATHROP, 1768, TO 1851.

JOHN LATHROP. — HENRY WARE, JUN. — RALPH WALDO
EMERSON. — CHANDLER ROBBINS.

THE first steps towards the settlement of the next pastor of the Second Church were taken during the dangerous sickness of Mr. Checkley, which immediately preceded his death. It was felt to be necessary that a colleague should be chosen to assist him, even in case he should recover. According to our records, a meeting of the church was held, the 10th of March, 1768, to make the preliminary arrangements for the choice of a suitable person to fill that office. Rev. Dr. Pemberton, then minister of the New Brick, was invited to be present, to assist the church by his counsels and prayers. It was found that the thoughts of nearly all the members both of church and congregation were fixed on Mr. John Lathrop, who had been several months engaged in supplying their pulpit. They were very careful, it seems, to ascertain his theological sentiments, and to guard the church against the danger, even then apprehended, of departure from the "doctrines of grace, and the old form of faith and discipline adopted in the New England churches." The candidate was desired to come before them; and, at their request, Dr. Pemberton asked

him a variety of questions concerning his sentiments "upon many of the great doctrines of the gospel." The church unanimously declared themselves satisfied with his answers. At a subsequent meeting, Dr. Pemberton read Mr. Lathrop's confession of faith, and also a certificate from a number of ministers in the county of Windham, Connecticut, respecting Mr. Lathrop's qualifications, and recommending him to the choice of any church that might call him. The members of the church then gave in their votes, twenty-five in number, and all for Mr. Lathrop. Subsequently, the congregation and church, voting together, elected him unanimously by sixty-seven votes. The ordination took place, May 18, 1768; the pastor elect preaching the sermon.

John Lathrop was born, May 17, 1740, in Norwich, Conn. From his early youth he was remarkable for those excellent moral traits which distinguished him in after-life, and are among the best qualifications for the Christian ministry. He commenced in youth the study of medicine; but a stronger bias soon turned his thoughts towards that sacred office which he was afterwards so usefully to fill.*

The ministry of Dr. Lathrop † was long, faithful, and useful. His character has been described with as much

* He graduated at Princeton College, New Jersey, 1763. For a short time after, he was an assistant to Dr. Wheelock, in Moors' Indian School, then kept at Lebanon.

† He received the degree of Doctor of Divinity from the University of Edinburgh, in 1784. This degree, as was not unusual at the time, was obtained by purchase by a friend or friends. It was procured in the same way for both the Drs. Eliot and Dr. Howard. The University of Cambridge was not then in the habit of granting the degree of D.D. — *Historical Notices of New North.*

truth as beauty, by one who, educated under his ministry, and favored with ample opportunities to become acquainted with his virtues, was happily qualified to discharge the duty of commemoration which appropriately devolved upon him from his connection with a sister-church. The sermon preached by Dr. Parkman, at his interment, has left little to be supplied by any future biographer. It paints in clear and simple colors his unfeigned piety, his pure conscientiousness, his amiable temper and most winning spirit of Christian love, his delightful candor, the tenderness and gentleness of his domestic affections, his serene dignity, his public spirit, his devoted attachment to liberty, his unyielding defence of the rights of conscience, his energy and firmness when the cause of truth demanded or the public good required, and his beautiful resignation and triumphant composure in the hour of death.

His light shone with a mild and steady, rather than a brilliant lustre. As a preacher, he instructed, rather than delighted; wisely counselled and gently led his hearers, rather than powerfully moved them. Without being remarkable for learning, he was respected for the soundness of his thoughts, the weight of his opinions, and the soberness of his judgment. Without extraordinary natural gifts, he performed such a multitude of useful labors, brought forth such rich fruits of goodness, and laid upon his generation such obligations for his various benefits, as would have done honor to a man of far more exalted abilities and genius. There are many among us who can distinctly recall his venerable aspect, as, in his advanced age, he stood in the pulpit, or walked through the streets

amidst respectful salutations and cordial greetings. No clergyman of his day is better remembered, and none more frequently spoken of, or mentioned with greater reverence and love. Some of you, my hearers, esteem it a privilege that you were baptized by his hand, and received a benediction in your infancy from his saintly lips. His name, in the northern part of the city, is still as a household word. And the descriptions of his venerable form and apostolic appearance, that have been so often heard from aged friends at your firesides, have given shape and distinctness to his image, even in the minds of your children. His aged body moulders with the dust of his loved companions in the old "Granary Burying-ground;" his virtues live in the history of this church; and his name is still young in the hearts of rising generations.

Dr. Lathrop's ministry covered the long period of fifty years, from his ordination to his death, at an advanced age, on the 4th of January, 1816. His services of a public nature were extensive; and he was honored with many important stations and trusts. He was a member of the Corporation of Harvard College nearly forty years, and an officer in most of the important charitable and literary societies of Massachusetts. His doctrinal views underwent a gradual and material change towards the close of the last century. At the commencement of his ministry, his confession of faith was in conformity to the Calvinistic sentiments then embraced by the Second Church; but, as life advanced, he became less and less "orthodox," and — without the spirit of sectarianism, which was contrary to his nature — lent his influence to the "liberal" side.

Dr. Lathrop had been settled but a few years before the war of the American Revolution broke out; the effect of which upon the destiny of the Second Church was first disastrous, and afterwards favorable. "From the memorable 19th of April, 1775," writes Dr. Lathrop in our church records, "the day on which the British troops began hostilities in America, there are no records of the Old North Church for more than a year.

"The town being held as a strong garrison by the British troops, and surrounded by a large army of Americans, it was found necessary for the greatest part of the inhabitants to go into the country, not only to escape the dangers of war, but to seek the means of subsistence.

"At this time, most of the churches in the town were broken up; and, while the pastor of this church and the members in general were dispersed abroad, a number of evil-minded men, of the king's party, obtained leave of General Howe to pull down the Old North Meeting-house, under a pretence of wanting it for fuel, although there were then large quantities of coal and wood in the town.

"The house, which was built in 1677, was in very good repair, and might have stood many years longer, had not those sons of violence, with wicked hands, razed it to the foundation.

"On the 17th of March, 1776, the king's troops evacuated the town; and the Americans, under the brave General Washington, took possession."

The inhabitants came back with mingled emotions of rejoicing and sadness,—glad once more to occupy unmo-
lest their beloved homes, and pay their vows in their

venerated temples ; whilst, with a melancholy curiosity and just indignation, they surveyed the marks of violence and ruin which hostile hands had left upon their fair inheritance. But the hearts of none of them were more oppressed with gloom than those of the former members of the Second Church, when, revisiting the site of their ancient sanctuary, they found nothing in its place but a heap of ruins. It happened, however, fortunately for them that a neighboring society was able and ready to offer them ample accommodation. The New Brick Church, as it was called, whose building was then, and until within a few years past, standing in Hanover-street, * having lost a large number of its members, and being under the care of an infirm and aged minister, Dr. Pemberton, very gladly extended its hospitality to Dr. Lathrop and his parishioners. The two societies commenced worshipping together on the 31st of March, 1776 ; and, on the 6th of May, 1779, agreed upon and adopted a plan of perpetual union, and were thenceforth incorporated under the name of the Second Church. †

The ordination of Henry Ware, jun., took place on the first day of January, 1817. Of him and his ministry I might forbear to speak, since I have already laid my wreath of love upon his chaste monument. It might be enough to say, that the more sober judgment of maturer years would not lead me to qualify the warm eulogium of youth ; that advancing time and longer reflection have only deepened the feeling of affectionate reverence with

* The History of the New Brick Church will be found in the second part of this book.

† See Appendix E.



Henry Ware Jr.

which I regarded him during his life; that his memory is still green in our hearts, as it is destined, I doubt not, to flourish so long as virtue shall be honored or goodness loved.

I cannot, however, allow this history of the church to which his name is so dear, and his services were so valuable, to go out of my hands, without a brief sketch of his character and ministry, even at the risk of repetition; especially since it may fall under the eye of those who have read neither the charming memoir by his brother, nor my own feeble biography.

Henry Ware, jun., was born in Hingham, Mass., April 21, 1794. He enjoyed in infancy the nurture of a Christian pastor's home. The first love of his childhood was that sacred business of his Father in heaven, in which the strength of his prime was spent, and to which his latest affections clung. The most intimate companions of his early days can recollect no period of his life when the office of the Christian ministry was not his ruling desire and aim. He seemed to regard himself, like some prophet of old, to have been consecrated from his birth to the service of the Temple. This sacred purpose stamped the character of his boyhood and youth. His feelings and actions were to a remarkable degree consistent with it. His lips refrained from impure and irreverent speech. His taste revolted at every shape of iniquity. He washed his hands in innocency. He entered not in unholy paths, but turned from them and passed away.

This *pure boyhood*,—this unspotted youth,—what a fit and beautiful foundation for a holy priesthood! Through

such a path, he ascended at length into the hill of the Lord, and stood in his holy place. Through such stages of early preparation, my friends, the unseen hand of Providence led him along, until his feet rested at your own altar, and his unstained hands were appointed to break to you the holy bread. How favored the church that had the best prayers and choicest labors of such a minister! How happy the minister who could look back upon such a blameless life!

The New Year's day on which his ministry in this church began will ever be a memorable era in its history. Entering upon his arduous work with no startling exhibitions of eloquence or zeal, with no straining for sudden effect, but with a devoted purpose to be laborious and faithful, and a single eye to the sacred objects of the ministry, the first-fruits of his well-sustained efforts gradually and steadily ripened around him. The spiritual and external interests of the parish advanced with a regular and healthy growth. Another golden age, like that which it had enjoyed under the first of the Mathers, dawned upon the prospects of the church. The throng of worshippers swelled from sabbath to sabbath. The influence of the pulpit became more powerful and deep. The aged more frequently dignified the congregation with their silvery crowns, and the young enlivened it with their blooming brows. The ordinances rejoiced and shed abroad their divinest odors. The beautiful bands of love and peace spread and strengthened from heart to heart. The joyous cry of Christian activity went round. The holy vine grew verdant in all its branches.

I believe that there could not have been found, at the period to which I refer, a parish more prosperous, or a ministry more effective, than his. There were more splendid edifices than those old walls, which loved the echoes of his impressive voice. There were more wealthy and fashionable and highly cultivated congregations than that which gathered around him, with attentive faces and captivated hearts. There were more graceful rhetoricians, and more learned theologians, occupying the sacred desk. But where was there a temple more fragrant with the breath of devotion, more beautiful with the spiritual adornings of holiness and peace? Where was there a society more harmonious or more engaged? And where was the preacher whose whole air and action and tones were more suited to the messages of Heaven, or whose discourses and prayers had more moral and spiritual effect?

The flower of Mr. Ware's affections, and the best fruits of his labors, were consecrated to his own society. But his influence and energies, though concentrated upon this parish, were not restricted within its limits. The only horizon which bounded his benevolence was the broad circle of human want. The only fetter which his virtuous activity could brook was the strong chain of necessity, fastened to us by Him who wisely limited the faculties of man,—who gave to the largest souls as feeble bodies as the rest, that they might learn to be patient and humble. Every valuable enterprise of the Christian body to which he belonged, if it did not originate with his active spirit, was quickened by his zeal, or directed by his wisdom. Of the American Unitarian Association he was one of the

founders ; and for eleven years, as Foreign Secretary or on the Executive Committee, a laborious officer. The Evangelical Missionary Society is to no individual so greatly indebted, whether for the constancy of his support, or the amount of his collections. Of the ministry at large in this city, though others may have the praise, Mr. Ware is virtually the father.

But to enumerate all the religious associations of which he was a member would be but to exhaust their catalogue. The cause of Peace found in him a kindred spirit and a fervid tongue. The cause of Freedom was near to his heart ; and, if some of its more ardent votaries had, years ago, listened to the suggestions of meek wisdom and considerate charity which he offered to bring to their conventions, it is my firm conviction, that the evil which they oppose would have been at this day nearer to its end. To the greatest reform of the age he gave his strong and undeviating aid ; an aid, the value of which may be illustrated by the fact, that the *twelfth thousand* of his Discourse on Temperance, which had an extensive circulation in this country, was for sale in the capital of the British empire. The interests of Education also were not only fostered by his favoring words, but substantially advanced by his writings and his labors.

In fine, his heart had a warm pulse for every claim of charity. His lips had a tone of truthful and earnest eloquence for every need of man. His feet were never weary of running on missions of mercy. He never withheld his hands from any work of love, when it was in their power to it. No thought of himself enticed him from the sacrifices

of kindness. The fatigues of benevolence were the exhilaration of his days; the weariness of duty, the anodyne of his nights.

But the aggregated labors of love, which his spirit courted, were too heavy a load for the flesh to bear. Indeed the body would have sooner given way beneath it, but for the sincere delight which its pressure gave to his heart.

In the beginning of the year 1828, Mr. Ware's health, which had for a long time given signs of failure, began seriously to decline. The fears of the parish were excited, and its sympathy manifested by every indulgence it could render. But his disease increased to such an extent as to satisfy him that he must relinquish his duties for many months, and to cause some apprehensions that he might be taken from them for ever. Under these circumstances, he addressed a letter to his parishioners on the last Sunday of the year 1828, the twelfth year of his ministry, tendering the resignation of his office, and asking that their connection might be immediately dissolved. "I feel," he says, "that I ought to hesitate no longer. I ought to relieve you from the uncertainty and trials of your present condition. And I ought to relieve myself from those solitudes on your behalf, which do not avail to your benefit, and which are unfavorable to my own restoration to strength. In doing this, I perform one of the most painful acts of my life. My situation has satisfied every wish of my heart. Other men may have labored more faithfully and successfully; but no one can ever have looked back upon twelve years of a happier connection."

This communication was received, as the records of the

parish certify, with "excited feelings of deep sympathy, regret, and disappointed hopes." A committee was appointed to take it into consideration. Their report unanimously recommended, "that our pastor be desired to remain with us; and that measures be taken for the choice of some person of piety and ability, in whom we may unite, to be his colleague; to assist him in the discharge of his duties, and share with him the burdens of his office."

The recommendation of the committee was sanctioned by the parish, and cordially approved by Mr. Ware; and, on the 11th of January, 1829, the office of colleague was filled by the election of Mr. Ralph Waldo Emerson, who received ordination on the 11th of the following March. About this time, Mr. Ware received from the corporation of Harvard University an appointment to the professorship of pulpit eloquence and the pastoral care, — a professorship founded by the subscriptions of individuals, as much out of respect to the proposed incumbent, as for the sake of the benefits of such an office.

From the spring of 1829 to the summer of 1830, Mr. Ware was travelling in Europe. It was a tour, not of relaxation only, but of rich improvement to his mind and heart. Nearly his whole pathway through foreign lands was smoothed by kindness, and enlivened by hospitality. The homes of strangers were opened to him in his absence from his own. New friendships were established in almost every city and town in which he tarried, — friendships, some of which were afterwards continued across the ocean, and will be renewed beyond the grave.

Soon after his return from Europe, Mr. Ware entered

upon his new office at Cambridge, and tendered his resignation to his parish with the strongest expressions of gratitude for their kindness, and of interest in their future well-being; and a vote was passed, with a full response of esteem and love, dissolving the pastoral connection from and after the third day of October, 1830. So closed that sacred, that happy relation.

But at Cambridge, as well as in Boston, it was the lot of Mr. Ware to be overburdened with useful occupations, partly of his own seeking, but partly also by the inconsideration and importunity of others, till flesh and heart sunk under their number and variety.

Mr. Ware remained at Cambridge till the summer of 1842. At that time, hopeless of being able to continue his duties, he sought, but too late, for a home of quiet and peace in the retirement of the country. A kind Hand led him to a spot in every respect suited to his taste and his want; whither it seemed to him as if God had guided him at length, through floods and over rough places, to find a resting-place for his weary feet beneath the olive-shade for which he had longed.

Yet even here he was not idle. From his retreat, he looked out with an interested eye upon the movements of the busy world he had left behind him. Thoughts and plans of benevolence and usefulness floated through his tranquil mind. His pen also found employment suited to the quietness of his environment and his peaceful feelings, in portraying the character, and tracing the calm and holy life, of the late venerable Dr. Worcester, who has been so appropriately named the "Apostle of Peace." The con-

cerns of the churches, in whose behalf he had so long labored, were not neglected; nor were the counsels which were always so much sought after and valued by his brethren withholden.

But a gentle Shepherd was leading him, in a steady advance, through green pastures, and by the side of still waters, down into the valley of the shadow of death. More than once, however, a friendly angel was sent to accelerate his journey, and to give gentle and repeated warnings to his friends to be prepared for his removal. It touched, but without rudeness, the springs of his intellectual life. It disturbed, but without violence, the fountain of his affections, the Siloam which had healed and blessed so many. But, disturbed as it was, the fountain flowed and sparkled still for those who waited at its brink. His mind was often inwardly active, when all expression was denied him; and, even when he was apparently asleep, was following passively the shadowy and dreamy flow of his fancy. "My mind," he would say, "is crowded with thoughts, precious thoughts, of death and immortality;" thoughts which he longed to utter. In hours of perfect consciousness, he uniformly declared his conviction, that the time of his departure had come, the "fitting time," the "best time;" and occasional allusions to the approaching change showed the peace and serenity of his mind. "It was," says one who never left him, "as when the parting of the clouds, on a dark evening, shows here and there a bright star in the space beyond: we know as well that the whole heaven is radiant with its countless myriads still as if the whole atmosphere were clear, and we saw them all."

Not a word, not a look, indicated a desire to return to life; and yet every precious memory of the past, every interest of the large circle of friends that he loved, was as dear and as strong as ever. In one or two short intervals between his continually lengthening seasons of seeming or entire unconsciousness, words of most precious import were spoken to his children, the impression of which can never be effaced. On one occasion, his thoughts turned to the closing hours and acts of the Master whom he loved; and, speaking of the design of Jesus in instituting the last supper, as if inspired by the very spirit of His own boundless benevolence, he stretched out his feeble arms, saying, "He intended it for all; he would gather all to his embrace."

He was now constantly anticipating a sudden call to depart, for which nothing remained to be put in readiness; and there is no doubt that he was aware of the time when the mandate came, and yielded himself up with a quiet and childlike submission. As death came upon him, he threw gently over him the veil of deepest sleep; under which he lay for a few hours, still breathing, composed and tranquil, whilst his spirit was loosing itself from its worn-out members, and sighing itself back to God.

How sweet the rest it found! What a zest has the repose of immortality, after such a laborious life! What a beautiful convoy across the dark flood, the smiling images of his holy works, which, the Spirit saith, attend the good man, as, on the buoyant wings of faith and hope, he floats from earth to heaven! "He hath died in the Lord!" from henceforth how blessed! Well done, good

and faithful servant! thou hast been faithful over a few things: thou art now ruler over many things.

Mr. Ware's character was not a difficult one to understand. It had some hues, indeed, that all did not see, — hues of rare and delicate beauty, which were clearly perceived only by his most intimate friends. It had variety, too, and richness; reserved stores of genius and strength and love and mirth, which kept alive the interest and curiosity of those who were most often in his society. But, notwithstanding all this, so great was his simplicity, that any, who knew him at all, knew his principal characteristics. In his own family, he was, in all important particulars, what he was to the world. He was not one thing in one place, and another in another, but always the same. Though sometimes reserved, he never dissimulated. If he ever wore a veil, it was of nature, and not of guile. No man living was more truthful, or more in earnest in all that he said and did. His heart was too sound in virtue to desire any false coloring on the surface; his soul was too ingenuous and noble to endure it, even if it had been needed. His conversation, his preaching, and his writings, were, to a remarkable degree, the transcript of his own mind and heart; and because that mind was sound and wise and pure, and that heart warm, devout, and true, therefore it came to pass, that, in all these modes of influence, he exerted an unusual and uniform power upon the opinions, sentiments, and principles of men. He was not a great logician; but when he reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and a judgment to come, with the earnestness of deep conviction, with the logic of

common sense, with the authoritative arguments of truth and love, the reason assented, the conscience trembled, the heart submitted. He was not a profound theologian; but his mind was well furnished with the most valuable treasures of sacred lore, and held at his command a magazine of illustrations, expositions, and proofs of all the great doctrines which he had examined and believed, and therefore preached. He was not a graceful rhetorician, if judged by artificial rules; but in that plain, serious, earnest eloquence, which is most appropriate to the pulpit, whether we estimate him by the interest his preaching always attracted or by the effects it often produced, he has left behind him no superior, and not many equals. He was not a scholar, in the ordinary acceptance of that word, nor a man of brilliant talents; but in amount and variety of general and useful knowledge, in quickness of intellectual perception, in correctness of taste, in the finer qualities of a poetic imagination, and in fervor and fertility of genius, he has given abundant evidences of high natural endowments and excellent culture. But, better than all, he was a good, a sound, a faithful man. His superiority is not seen in any conspicuous feature of greatness, but in the fulness, proportion, and solidity of his moral manliness. He was a hero of the Christian stamp; brave in the cause of virtue, without the flourish of arms; invincible in integrity, without boasting or arrogance; prompt in enterprises of benevolence, without impetuosity; patient in hardships, without the thirst of glory; overcoming evil with good, and achieving the victory over the world with the sword of the Spirit, under the breastplate of faith

and love. "The same shall be called *great* in the kingdom of heaven."

Mr. Ware died at Framingham, Mass., Sept. 22, 1843. His funeral was solemnized by appropriate religious services in the chapel of Harvard University. His body was followed to Mount Auburn by a long train of friends, and deposited, amid profound silence and with a hopeful sorrow, in the tomb of a friend, until arrangements could be made for its final and honorable interment on Harvard Hill.

Of the ministry of the living I may not speak without reserve. Ralph Waldo Emerson was ordained as colleague with Mr. Ware, March 11, 1829. The latter resigned his office, Sept. 26, 1830; and Mr. Emerson remained sole pastor for two years, when he was dismissed at his own request by reason of differences of sentiment between himself and the church and society in relation to the Lord's Supper, — differences, however, which were entertained on both sides without alienation of personal affection and esteem, and expressed on both sides with perfect moderation and candor, — differences which were the more regretted as necessary interruptions of a connection which was with many of the parish a strong and pleasant tie.

In June, 1832, Mr. Emerson invited the brethren of the church to meet at his house, "to receive a communication from him in relation to the views at which he had arrived respecting the ordinance of the Lord's Supper." After a statement of them, he proposed "so far to change the manner of administering the rite as to disuse the

elements, and relinquish the claim of authority ; and suggested a mode of commemoration which might secure the undoubted advantages of the Lord's Supper, without its objectionable features." After hearing this communication, the church appointed a committee to consider and report on the subject.* They reported the following resolutions: 1. "That in the opinion of this church, after a careful consideration of the subject, it is expedient to maintain the celebration of the Lord's Supper in the present form." 2. "That the brethren of this church retain an undiminished regard for the pastor, and entertain the hope that he will find it consistent with his sense of duty to continue the customary administration of the Supper." These resolutions were unanimously adopted.

The pastor afterwards, in a public discourse, explained to the society his views of the Lord's Supper, and informed them of the decision of the church. In conclusion he stated his conviction, that, as it was no longer in his power, with a single mind, to administer the communion, it became his duty to resign his charge. He therefore requested of the proprietors a dismissal, which was granted.

After the dismissal of Mr. Emerson, the pastoral office remained vacant till the ordination of the present incumbent, Dec. 3, 1833.

No Christian church ever received a young and inexperienced minister with more cordial and considerate kind-

* This committee consisted of Deacons Mackintosh and Patterson, Dr. John Ware, George B. Emerson, George A. Sampson, Gedney King, and Samuel Beal.

ness ; and no young preacher ever threw himself upon the affections and forbearance of a people altogether unknown to him, with a more entire and delightful confidence. Such was the commencement of our connection ; a connection which, in spite of the sore troubles and severe shocks that, during the course of it have come upon the parish, has never yet, from the first hour to the last, been otherwise than affectionate, confidential, and happy. Not to say as much as this would be as untruthful to my own cherished recollections and deepest feelings as it would be unjust and ungrateful to the uninterrupted current of your kindness, to the occasional extraordinary and distinguished tokens of your attachment, and to that precious and tried friendship which has been as honorable to you as a parish, as it has been sustaining and dear to your minister.

My thoughts revert now, and they love often to go back, to the condition of our society ten years ago. I re-enter our venerable church, crowned, like virtuous age, with a hoary glory ; consecrated by the prayers of many generations ; within whose massive walls came back to us that impressive voice which had so often, in former years, waked their solemn echoes, in unison with responsive tones from the deepest hearts of the people, to which its call of tremulous earnestness seldom failed to penetrate. Images of the dead and the living, in long and fair processions, thread its aisles, and line its pews with reverential ranks. Again I look down from its pulpit into the open faces of the friendly and peaceful throng, which, from sabbath to sabbath, with lively sympathy quickened a pastor's love, and, shoulder to shoulder, helped his feeble hands to bear

up the ark of the Lord. A happier church, a happier minister, a more united and devoted congregation, it would have been difficult to find.

But all this prosperity, which seemed to us so secure, soon vanished like a delightful dream, and left us, homeless and broken, to the sad and almost hopeless task of re-collecting a dismembered society, constructing a new parish out of the wrecks of the old, and finding, if possible, some humble place, with nothing of the dignity or sacredness of a church, to shelter us in the season of our devotions.

The history of this momentous change, though known to some of you, it is my duty carefully and truthfully to narrate. I will uncover the past so far as is absolutely necessary, and no further. With a feeling of sacredness and delicacy, I would deal with old transactions; with a hand of kindness touch painful recollections,—more glad, if it were possible, to leave them undisturbed in obscurity and silence. But, as this may not be, let us pause ere we look backward, and first invoke love to come into our hearts, hand in hand with truth, and forgiveness consorting with justice to lead and attend us in our retrospect.

The causes of that train of events which issued in the loss of the new church-edifice in Hanover-street are not of recent origin. The popularity and usefulness of Mr. Ware attracted several families to his society, whose homes were at a distance from the meeting-house; whilst, at the same time, not a few of his parishioners who had been living near their place of worship, obeying a tendency which has ever since been increasing, removed to a more southerly part of the city, but still retained their connection

with the Second Church. In the year 1832, during the ministry of Mr. Emerson, the worshippers were about equally divided into two parties: those who lived at the North End, and those who lived at the South; so that when it was found necessary to repair the old house, at the expense of about three thousand dollars, it became a question whether it would not be advisable to sell it, and erect a new, in a more central situation. The matter was the occasion of considerable talk and some feeling in the parish; and, the fact of such a discussion becoming generally known, an offer was made by the Roman Catholics to purchase the house and land in Hanover-street for the sum of nineteen thousand dollars. Those whose birth-place and dwellings and early associations strongly attached them to the locality of the old church, opposed the removal of the ancient landmark so strenuously, that they whose convenience led them to desire a change ceased to press their wishes, and allowed all action on the subject to subside. But, though not brought up in any parish meeting for several years, it formed the topic of frequent conversation, and was never out of the minds of the people.

At the commencement of his ministry, your present pastor saw and felt the existence of this *sectional division* of the society. It was the only circumstance which then or afterwards gave him any apprehension, or was the source of any trial. It was his endeavor, of course, to avoid alluding to it, or involving himself with it, in any way whatever, and to prevent its being brought forward in connection with any parish affairs.

In 1840, when it was found that the old house needed extensive repairs, the question of rebuilding necessarily, and very properly, came up again for discussion. The South End party had now become a majority, besides being more wealthy, and felt that they had a right at length to urge their claims, more especially as the interests of worship seemed to require a more accessible location. They agreed upon a site for the new church in Somerset-street, and went so far as to obtain subscriptions to a very large amount towards its erection. The North End portion of the society still objected, and with great firmness held out against removal. An offer was made to the pastor by the former, in case he would go with them, to push the matter to an immediate issue, obtain the largest possible vote, and proceed at once to build on the proposed location. This offer was refused by him without hesitation, because its acceptance, though it might be favorable, in some respects, to himself, and might result in the establishment of a flourishing society, would involve a division of the Second Church, to which his duty was pledged, and his affections were bound.

In this state of things, he ventured to address a letter to the parish, urging both parties to be studious of concord, and to make concessions for the common good; and expressing the belief that it would be possible, with the exercise of a little forbearance, to agree upon an arrangement that should satisfy and accommodate all the proprietors, and tend to the security and increase of the society. This arrangement, he suggested, must have respect to two points: first, the *location of the new church*, which ought to

be not further south than Court-street, nor further north than Union-street; and, secondly, *the cost of the building*. With regard to the latter point, the language of the letter was as follows:—

“A very expensive and splendid church, I am sure, it is not the general wish of the congregation to have. I am still more certain that such is not my desire. I can never look with approbation upon the too common practice of religious societies, of vying with one another in building showy and extravagant places of worship. The spirit which is thus manifested is not the spirit of Christ. The example is bad; the tendency, pernicious,—more especially, when, to accomplish this end, the society must run in debt. Such buildings exclude the poor, with those who are in moderate circumstances, and draw in those whose motives in selecting their place of worship are any thing but religious. They hold out a lure to ambitious men of small means to buy pews which they cannot honestly afford to own. They make the taxes burdensome, and lead to the indulgence of feelings of pride and vain show, which turn away attention from the spiritual worship of God, to the ‘marble dome and gilded spire, and costly pomp of sacrifice.’ We ought, if we build, to erect a capacious, commodious, substantial, and neat edifice; one, of which we shall neither be ashamed nor proud; one in which a good pew can be procured without extravagance; one which may go down to our children’s children by reason of its solidity, and burdened with no encumbrances by reason of the pride of their ancestors; one which, from the corner-stone to the pinnacle, shall be built up justly and honestly.”

This letter stopped, for a time, all further proceedings. An attempt was then made to find a suitable site somewhere in the part of the city recommended by the pastor. After the failure of this attempt, the South End members of the society gradually lost their interest in the project of removal, which seemed destined to continual disappointment; whilst the zeal of the other party increased, and their hopes strengthened. At length, having a small majority, the latter obtained a decisive vote to demolish the old church, and rebuild on the same spot, with the understanding that the whole cost of the new building should not exceed thirty-four thousand dollars. This proceeding produced much discontent, and caused the withdrawal of several of the most substantial parishioners.

The building committee, in their desire to procure a durable and beautiful house, that should not only be worthy of the society, but an ornament also to the north part of the city, caused to be erected the spacious and costly edifice, which, contrary to their expectations, has been the cause of unmeasured distress to the parish they hoped to honor.

When the building was completed, it was deemed necessary, in order to effect a sale of the pews, to appraise them for a sum very much less than the cost of construction. If *all* had been sold, there would still have remained a large debt. More than one hundred *were* purchased, and many for very large sums, and yet the debt was found to be not far from forty thousand dollars. For a large part of this amount, the building was mortgaged; the mortgage to run till 1851 or 1852. Notwithstanding this heavy and

dangerous burden, the society seemed steadily to increase. But the managers of its affairs were ever solicitous about the debt, and often deliberated concerning the mode of lightening or discharging it. The standing committee, with exceptions, were of opinion that the true course was to assess the pews for the whole amount, and pay it at once.

A parish meeting was called, and a vote demanded on this proposition. The meeting was very numerous attended, and the proposition negatived by an immense majority. A short time after, the committee called another meeting on parish affairs, at which very few of the proprietors were present; when it was voted, in substance, that the whole subject of the debt be left in the hands of the standing committee. The committee then proceeded to assess the whole debt on the pews. The assessment amounted to eighty per cent of their original cost. This act of the committee gave great offence. Nearly a hundred proprietors gave up their deeds on account of it. About twenty paid the assessment. In this emergency, your minister volunteered to endeavor, by personal application to the offended individuals, to induce them to repurchase. The twenty proprietors agreed, that, in case he would obtain the sale of *seventy-five* pews (the whole being reappraised so as to cover the debt), they would consent to admit the purchasers to their corporation. Those to whom he applied understood that they were only to be held bound to an engagement to repurchase, on condition that the whole number specified should be obtained. This was in the spring of 1849. Your pastor procured the

desired promise from nearly sixty individuals, when, being compelled by imperative calls of a domestic nature to take a short journey to the South, a committee appointed by the congregation agreed to take the business in charge, and try to complete the requisite list. When he returned, he found, to his surprise, that the project had been abandoned.

A few months after this, in June, 1849, your pastor addressed a letter to the proprietors, then reduced to about twenty, tendering his resignation. According to established usage, this letter would have been publicly read from the pulpit. But, from feelings of delicacy towards the small body of proprietors, it was sent to them through their clerk, and left at their disposal. It was never read to the congregation.

To this act of resignation, long deferred and most reluctantly performed, two powerful and deep convictions moved me. The first related to the utter hopelessness of saving the church-edifice; the other, to the possibility of saving the living body, the church and congregation, essentially the same, through a separation from the building.

After calm and thorough examination of the state of the parish, in connection with the causes that produced it, I was fully persuaded that there was no possibility either of discharging the debt of the society, or of keeping the society together with the pressure of that debt upon it. I had seen the failure of plan after plan suggested by others. I had been again and again disappointed at the want of success of my own efforts. I had noted the falling-off, one after another, of the oldest and most valuable members

of the parish, and was aware that the removal of a still greater number was impending. I saw division that I could not heal, and alienation to which I could apply no remedy,—division, not so much of will as of *necessity*; and alienation, not of intentional, but of *circumstantial* origin; whose cause was neither sudden nor particular, but manifold, and of many years' growth. I felt that under such circumstances my preaching was abortive. And a terrible vision, both of the loss of the house, and the ruin of the flock,—a vision which no man offered one valid reason to dispel,—haunted and affrighted me. Not hastily, not lightly, not willingly, did I take the initiatory step towards a separation from the proprietors. But after many prayers, after long reflection, after deliberate investigation, with unfeigned grief, with shrinking reluctance, and under the most solemn sense of responsibility, did I ask them to release me from a bond whose sacredness had previously impressed as much as its pleasantness had attracted me.

To save the edifice, therefore, and the society in connection with it, was, as I believed, utterly beyond hope. To remain longer attached to the house would be, as I felt confident, to see the ruin of the church and society. The only hope that remained was, that, separated from the building which was crushing them, the church and congregation, essentially the same, might still be kept alive. The house was but of yesterday; a pile of wood and stone, which wealth and handicraft could at any time destroy and replace. But the church was venerable with age; rich in sacred recollections; renowned in the eccle-

siastical annals of New England; honored in the esteem of all for the ancient worthies, famed in church and state, whose names were enrolled amongst its members; and very dear to many of us as the nurse of our early faith, — overgrown with sweet and hallowed recollections of religious services and joys, of Christian friends and Christian instructors, many of them long since passed from its bosom to the communion of the blest, who had bequeathed to it the rich inheritance of their virtues, and the precious legacy of their dying benedictions.

Concern for the salvation of this, together with the flock long bound to one another and to my heart by closest ties, absorbed all other concern. For *these* I felt that no sacrifice would be too costly. If only these might survive, the loss of the building, however painful and mortifying, would be comparatively small.

But *could* the flock be saved? Would its members ever reunite? After so many trials and disappointments; after heavy pecuniary losses; after the shame and shock of losing their house of worship; after having been once actually scattered, with no local centre and no external bond, — was it probable, was it possible, that they would ever again come together, and take upon themselves anew the labor and expense of supporting public worship?

These questions were continually asked. And they who did not know this people invariably gave to them but one answer, "It could not be." I often asked these questions of myself; sometimes with deep solicitude. The prospect was most discouraging; the difficulties seemed almost countless and insuperable. Again and again, my

heart was on the point of failing me. But I could not despair. I could not give up all hope. I could not be brought to look aside to any other pastoral connection. I could not contemplate any provision for myself in the contingency of failure.

At the bottom of my heart there was a feeling of trust that could not be rooted out,—trust in you, dear friends, and trust in God. I knew the flock too well to believe that they would suffer their old associations to be for ever dissolved, their sacred and pleasant ties to be for ever broken, without an effort. I knew the flock too well to believe that their hearts would not cling together, after all external bonds should be broken. I had confidence in them, that nothing short of impossibility would discourage them from attempting a re-organization. I felt all the while, even in the darkest days of absence, a secret attraction holding me back from all new connections; an attraction which I was sure was but responsive to that which acted upon your own hearts; a strong and sweet constraint that I have often interpreted to myself in the beautiful words in which friendship, of old time, expressed the warmth and fidelity of its cohesive instinct: “Entreat me not to leave thee, or to return from following after thee; for whither thou goest, I will go; and where thou lodgest, I will lodge: thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God. Where thou diest will I die; and there will I be buried. The Lord do so to me, and more also, if aught but death part thee and me.”

I had confidence also in God, who heareth the prayers of his children, and is faithful to remember the labors of

his servants; that God to whom our fathers, and the shepherds of our ancient fold, have cried for a blessing upon the church of their love; that God who saw their toils for its prosperity, and knows that in heaven they could have no greater joy than to see it flourishing and at peace, rising up in renewed vigor from its low estate, putting on again its beautiful garments, sending out the kind invitations of the Spirit, and gathering, as in former days, many sons and daughters to glory.

How well-founded this confidence, how faithful and how merciful the God of our fathers, and our own God, let the remembrance of the past tell us, let this day's spectacle attest.

The proprietors, soon after the resignation of their minister was offered, voted to accept it, and to close their house. It was never afterwards opened for worship by the Second Church. Meanwhile, before the intervention of a single sabbath after the close of the meeting-house, the communicants of the church, called together by the deacons, voted unanimously to request their pastor to continue his ministrations, and appointed a committee to procure a suitable place of worship. Such a place was obtained; a large majority of the congregation assembled; and all the ordinances of religion have been regularly administered till the present time.*

In the spring of 1850, the proprietors of the church in Freeman Place, discouraged on account of the long illness of their minister, Rev. James Freeman Clarke, offered to

* The society worshipped a great part of the time in the Masonic Temple.

sell their building to this society, on terms quite reasonable and advantageous to us. The offer was gladly accepted; and, through the munificence of several individuals amongst yourselves, the sum necessary for the purchase was raised, without a heavy burden upon the remainder of the parish.

The proprietors of the house in Hanover-street, having sold their property in it to the Methodists, and settled up their affairs, voted to take the deed of the church in Freeman Place in their corporate name, and to call their former minister to resume his official relations to their body, in order that this society might be fully entitled, according to the terms of the law, to the name and records of the "Second Church."

Such is a correct statement of the principal facts pertaining to the history of the loss of the church-edifice in Hanover-street; concerning which, false impressions have gone abroad. One of these is, that the society was forced to sell because it was too poor to pay for the building. Those who know the truth know well that the parish could have discharged their debt without difficulty, had there only have been unanimity of feeling among its members. Some of you are aware of the fact, that wealthy individuals pledged themselves to the pastor to carry the church through its embarrassments, provided the society would unite upon the plan he proposed. *The sole causes of the sacrifice of the building, I assert without fear of contradiction, were but these two: first, the want of unanimity, to which I have just referred; and, secondly, a belief on the part of many judicious and able men in the society, that, even*

if the debt should be paid, the location of the church was such as to make it difficult, if not impossible, in the course of a few years, to find a congregation, of our mode of faith, in the north part of the city, large enough to fill and support it. The latter cause accounts in part for the former. It explains the lukewarmness and indisposition with regard to the liquidation of the debt on the part of some who always had been before, and have been since, most devoted to the welfare of the society, and most unsparing in their pecuniary contributions. Neither their judgment nor their feelings went with the movement to build or to sustain so large and costly a church in a position unaccommodating to themselves, and, as they supposed, unfavorable to the prospect of a flourishing congregation of their own household of faith.

One additional remark I feel constrained to make, before leaving this painful retrospect. I would do justice and give honor in their turn to those few of my old parishioners who paid the heavy assessment, retained the proprietorship of their pews, and stood by their meeting-house to the last. We are bound to believe, that they acted, as they supposed, for the best interests of the society. The way they wished to take, and for themselves did take, to free the church from debt, was a simple, straightforward, and summary one. It would obviously have been effectual at once, had all the proprietors agreed to it. Some who took this method, did it, we know, at a pecuniary cost they were ill able to bear. For their manly and conscientious sacrifice, they deserve, and shall have, our respect. Nor can I forbear, on this occasion, to express the gratitude and esteem

I feel towards those members of our society whose homes and local attachments bind them closely to the northern part of the city, but who have steadily and unweariedly followed this church in its migrations, helped to sustain it in its days of trial, and generously contributed to provide for us this new sanctuary, so far from their own doors. How beautiful, how honorable, and how sacred, are those religious affections, and that Christian friendship, which thus show themselves stronger than all local attachments, and all sectional prejudices and interests!

And now, my friends, as we review the recent history of our church, let us ponder well the lessons it so impressively teaches. They are lessons which the whole religious community has need presently to learn. They are lessons which many Christian societies would do well to heed. For our experience is involved with principles of deeper interest and wider concern than any that affect merely the condition of a single church. It has important connections with the ecclesiastical manifestations and religious tendencies of the present age. It is illustrative, admonitory, exemplary.

The thought that was at the root of our misfortunes is one that, to a greater or less degree, influences nearly all modern Christian organizations and enterprises; and, wheresoever and howsoever it is involved with them, corrupts their purity and weakens their power. This thought, it is true, did not shape itself into distinct form, in the mind of any of our parishioners; nor did they suspect, perhaps, its existence in their hearts. Their purpose, as they understood it, was to do honor to their society; their

wish, to strengthen and advance their church. But how great the error to imagine that religion can be supported and advanced except by a *religious spirit*! How fatal the mistake to suppose that it is dependent, for its vitality and success, upon measures of worldly policy, upon exterior adornment, upon the patronage of the wealthy, the favor of the fashionable, the countenance of men in high places, or upon any thing which the wit of man can devise, or the hand of man construct, except under the influence of the Holy Spirit, and through the inherent power of a living faith and piety! This looking at religion from without, this consulting for it in externals, this constant regard to what will make it attractive, imposing, comfortable, influential, according to a worldly estimate, — this it is which, as much as any thing else, draws away attention from the weightier matters of Christianity, emasculates faith, uses up religious feeling, and steals away from Christian enterprise the very secret of its energy.

How small the debt religion owes, in our day, to those who build her costly temples! How small her obligation to those who, to provide splendid accommodations for her meek spirit and her simple rites, entangle her hallowed interests with pecuniary embarrassments and disputes, and connect her sacred name with obloquy, by involving it with debts, mortgages, and financial schemes. When great reverence, combined with great wealth and a munificent spirit, burning to give some equal expression to its high emotions, builds itself into a majestic pile as spontaneously as David's adoration wrought itself into a majestic psalm, man can admire with a glow of devotion; and God per-

haps, to whom the offering is made, approve, accept, and consecrate. But when pride, without means or without self-sacrifice, strains, contrives, borrows, and begs, to raise a splendid edifice; or when a love of show, with ample means, lavishes expense and ornament upon the house of prayer, to gratify *itself* under pretence of honoring God, — good sense and piety are alike ashamed, and Christianity is injured rather than advanced. Religion is more attractive and strong, unsheltered, unadorned, in groves or caverns, or in the wilderness under the open sky, with no contributions of wealth or art, than in marble temples which ambition and pride have built, and at gorgeous altars where she cannot minister without a feeling of incumbrance and restraint, because the pavement beneath, and the arches above her, are not freely and entirely her own. She loves the place where the poor come with the rich; where want is not reminded of its coarse attire; where worldly distinctions are not recognized; where, if there be magnificence and beauty, they are the free offerings of reverence and love, — like the costly presents of frankincense and gold which the Eastern Magi laid before the infant Saviour; not as if he cared for such things, nor to heighten the effect of his own meek loveliness, but as tokens of their veneration, emblems of his sovereignty, symbols of the more precious offerings of the heart with which men should appear before him.

Oh! how much in this age do we need to have our attention turned from the outward to the inward of religion and the holy life; to have our thoughts carried down from the surface to the profounder depths of Christian doctrine

and Christian experience! How much do we need to have impressed upon us the truth, that religion can advance no faster and no further than its own spirit rises, enlarges, becomes more intense and more pure, in the hearts of God's individual children; that temples and altars cannot make or propagate religion, except so far as religion makes and uses them; that wealth, power, learning, art, cannot spread Christianity, till she has first inspired and consecrated them; that the root of true Christian usefulness and strength grows in the silent depths of the devout and faithful spirit; and that Christ can come in the world only through the secret gates and the everlasting doors of hearts that open inwardly towards heaven!

Such lessons as these, it is to be hoped, *we*, my friends, have learnt thoroughly, through the chastisement that their misunderstanding has brought upon us. And if it be so, and if our misfortunes, widely observed, may have helped to impress these same truths more deeply upon the whole religious community, those misfortunes have been *worth their cost*; and, in view of the spiritual result to which Providence has made them instrumental, we have more reason, I think, for thanksgiving than for regret,—especially, since we have survived and been supported through them,—especially, since the good God, who saw fit to bring us down, has been pleased at length to raise us up,—especially, since there mingle with the remembrance of our suffering, sweet recollections of his gracious succor,—especially, since on looking back we can now say, as did the Seventy returning to Jesus from the arduous mission on which they went out, without purse or scrip or staff,

"We have lacked nothing." We have never been without a covert; we have never been deprived of the bread of heaven; we have never been destitute of the sympathy of the churches; we have never been without the most liberal and ample contributions from amongst ourselves for the honorable maintenance of worship; we have never been without a perfect trust, that He who led us into the wilderness would find us a path, if we waited his time, through cloud and trial, to a higher condition of individual virtue, and a position of more elevated usefulness.

And we have not been disappointed of our hope,—who ever waited upon Him, and *was* disappointed? At the very last extremity, as it seemed to us, in the hour of greatest darkness, the hour of our deliverance came. The star of promise, that, shining before us in our prayers, had led us hopefully on, seemed setting for ever; but it was only going down because its ministry was needed no more when the bright reality to which it had been guiding us was close at hand.

But I must bring this lengthened discourse to a close. I have endeavored to lay before you what could be gathered up from our records that seemed worthy of recital. I have attempted to do justice to the characters of all my predecessors in the ministry of the Second Church. I have reviewed with you the history of the remote and the recent past; traced all the way through which the Lord our God hath led us; recalled the beautiful days of our former peace, and the dark days of our later trial. And now, as we look back, every painful incident, brightened and interpreted by the light of our present joy, seems to

us but a necessary part of a needed discipline,—a veiled minister of Divine Love, under a deep veil, guiding us and helping us, though we knew it not, to the green pastures and the still waters, and the blessed re-union which we are enjoying to-day.

As one after another I have called the names of our venerated pastors and teachers, and recounted their valuable labors, I have felt as if their spirits, evoked for a while from their different stages of ascent up the holy heights, had, one after another, come back to us, with attending trains of the saints whom they led to glory, till at length they all have gathered over us, smiling to behold our joy, and blessing God together with us, that he “hath extended mercy to us, to give us a reviving, to set up the house of our God, and to repair the desolations thereof, and to give us a wall in” the city that was dear to them, and is dear to us, as “Judah and Jerusalem.”

Seeing, then, that we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us renew our vows of fidelity and love to God, and to each other; and, taking the sacred ark that has been entrusted to our charge, upon our shoulders, and to our hearts, bear it on prayerfully and steadily and hopefully into another century.

And now, my friends, I give place to the oldest and most venerable of my predecessors, and join you, as an attentive listener, to the pregnant words of his last “Testimony to the Churches:”—

“I am now in the eighty-fourth year of my age, and under a feebleness in the valley of the shadow of death,—wherein the Lord is yet a light unto me, and makes it *but*

a *shadow* of death,—and I am every hour waiting and longing for my dismission to a better world. In these circumstances I do declare, that the *principal design* upon which these colonies were first planted was to profess and practise and enjoy, with undisturbed liberty, the holy religion of God our Saviour, exhibited in the Sacred Scriptures, and rescued from the inventions and abuses [of man]; and more particularly to set up churches for our Lord Jesus Christ, that shall keep themselves loyal to him, their glorious King, and faithful to the religion of the Second Commandment. . . . It is now the dying wish of one who has been for about threescore and six years, after a poor manner, but, I hope, with some sincerity, serving the best of Masters, in the blessed work of the gospel, that the churches may stand firm in the faith and order of the gospel, and hold fast what they have received, and let no man take away their crown. But there may be danger of a generation arising which will not know the Lord, nor the works done by him and for him among his people here. And therefore, from the suburbs of that glorious world into which I am now entering, I earnestly testify unto the rising generation, that, if they sinfully forsake the God, the hope, and the religious ways of their pious ancestors, the glorious Lord will severely punish their apostasy, and be terrible from his holy places upon them. Now, the Lord our God be with you, as he was with your fathers! Let him not leave you nor forsake you! Lord, let thy work appear unto thy servants, and thy glory unto their children.” *

* Signed, Increase Mather, Nov. 10, 1722.



Chandler Robbins

HISTORY OF THE NEW BRICK CHURCH.

It has already been stated in the preceding pages, that, on the sixth day of May, 1779, the Second Church adopted a plan of perpetual union with the New Brick, in which it was agreed that both should take the name and continue the records and line of descent of the older of the two,—the Second Church. We have, therefore, as descendants in part from that religious body, and possessors of its records, a commemorative duty to discharge to the New Brick Church. This obligation I attempted to fulfil in two discourses preached on the sabbath immediately before the demolition of the Old Meeting-house in Hanover-street, which our society inherited from the last-named branch of its ancestry. Those discourses are not now to be procured, and were never exposed for sale; fewer, through a strange mistake, having been printed than were subscribed for. A new edition of them, as some of my readers are aware, has been several times called for by our society; and individuals have generously offered to take upon themselves the whole expense of a reprint. But the offer has been hitherto refused, partly in anticipation of this volume, in which I supposed it might be necessary to use them. After consultation with the committee for the publication of this book, I have concluded to republish here the strictly historical part of the discourses referred to, with little more abbreviation than is necessary to avoid repeating what has already been said in the History of the Second Church relating to the junction of the two churches, and events subsequent thereto.

HISTORY

OF THE

NEW BRICK CHURCH.

It is a cause of unfeigned regret, that the otherwise gratifying retrospect of the annals of the New Brick Church is alloyed by a review of the circumstances under which it originated. The only blot upon its records stains their very first page. Its foundation was laid in dissension and alienation between brethren of one faith, inhabitants of one neighborhood, and members of one church.

It is an ungrateful task to search out and expose the weaknesses of our fathers. Nor have I any heart for uncovering the long-buried animosities that once subsisted between two churches, which for these many years have been united together in the closest intercourse, and the most exemplary harmony. But I should be unfaithful to the duty which devolves upon me, if I were to suffer myself to be deterred, by the painfulness of the undertaking, from a candid and faithful statement of the facts and merits of the controversy which resulted in the building of this house. Besides, the history of this singular transaction is of itself not devoid of interest, and is still often

alluded to, though with a very imperfect knowledge of the facts of the case. An indefinite impression prevails in the community that there was something wrong in the origin of the New Brick Church, though precisely what the wrong was is not understood. It becomes, therefore, an act of justice to its founders to free their memory from all sweeping and vague imputations, and to lay open with discrimination and candor the real nature and amount of their offending.

At the commencement of the year 1719, there were two congregational churches at the north part of Boston, which was then the most respectable and fashionable section of the town. The one at the head of the North Square was under the pastoral charge of Drs. Increase and Cotton Mather; and the other at the corner of Clark and Hanover, then called North-street, under the care of the Rev. John Webb. Both churches were flourishing and fully attended, perfectly harmonious within themselves and with each other, and amply adequate to the accommodation of all in the neighborhood who might desire to meet in them for worship. But the latter, in conformity to the custom of the times, began to be desirous of settling an assistant pastor for the more effectual furtherance of the work of the ministry. The attention of several members of the church was attracted by the popularity and eminent gifts of the Rev. Peter Thacher, then over the church in Weymouth. A determination seems to have existed on the part of some of the New North Society, from the very first of the movement towards settling a colleague, to secure *his* services, if possible, at all hazards. No sooner

was this purpose apparent than many of the congregation began to manifest signs of disapprobation,—disapprobation founded upon the conviction that it was not right for a wealthier society to entice away from a poorer their minister. “Weymouth,” said they, “in God’s sight, is as precious as Boston; and the souls there, of as great worth as the souls here. And to the common objection, that it is a pity that Mr. Thacher, being so bright a light, should smoke out his days in so much obscurity, we answer, first, bright lights shine brightest in the darkest places; and, secondly, bright lights are the obscurer for burning in a room where there are more, and as bright.” *

No other adequate motive can be assigned for their opposition or their subsequent doings. Mr. Thacher himself was in all respects such a minister as would be likely to please their taste, to gratify their pride, and to build up the church. There was nothing objectionable in Mr. Webb, to excite their aversion. Nor do I find in any quarter so much as a hint, that there were any latent causes of division previously existing between the members of the society themselves. Nor were the characters of those who composed the opposition such as to warrant the supposition that they were originally actuated by unworthy motives, or lightly instigated to the course they took, or moved by any cherished feelings of hostility towards their own church. On the contrary, there are not wanting indications, on the part of some of their number, of strong attachment to the interests of the New North Church. Several of them had been amongst the most influential of

* See Appendix F.

the original founders of that society, of the first signers of the covenant, and of the building committee of the church; one had been donor of part of the communion plate, and, more recently, of a bell; and one had been the first choice of the church for the office of deacon.

No other cause can be found for the origin of their disaffection, save that which is assigned by themselves, viz. an insuperable objection against calling a minister away from his flock, and disapprobation of the measures taken by Mr. Thacher's friends to unsettle him at Weymouth.

It is some satisfaction, then, to be assured that there was a foundation in conscience and principle for the movement of the founders of this church, however blameworthy may have been the heat exhibited by them in the course of the controversy. There is no reason to doubt, that they were perfectly sincere in what they said in their "memorial" to the New North Church, written in the very height of the difficulty. "We should think ourselves obliged to love, honor, and respect you more than ever, if you would wholly lay aside Mr. Thacher, who, you know, is the sole cause of all our uneasiness." When we take into view the fact that the two parties were nearly equal in numbers, and that Mr. Thacher was finally elected by a majority of only one (and that, as has been said, the casting vote of the minister), it seems strange that the feelings of the memorialists should not have been more regarded. It seems strange that the New North Church and its pastor should have persisted in their purpose of settling Mr. Thacher, against the wishes of so large a portion of the congregation; against the unanimous advice of the

clergy of the town; against the general sense of the religious community, and at the risk of their own dismemberment. There can be no reasonable doubt, that, by a more moderate and pacific course on their part, the difficulty might have been healed, and those subsequent disturbances prevented which are a perpetual disgrace to all who were concerned in them. The counsel of such men as the two Mathers, Benjamin Wadsworth, Benjamin Colman, Joseph Sewall, Thomas Prince, and William Cooper, — all of them names justly celebrated in the churches of Boston, — was precisely such as the spirit of Christianity would have dictated. “We apprehend,” say they, in a letter signed by them all, “that it would be best that the New North should not push on the settlement of Mr. Thacher, and that *you* should not engage in the building of a new meeting-house. A patient waiting may cool and calm spirits that are discomposed and heated. Time, by the help of God, may give more light to us, to you, to Mr. Thacher, Mr. Webb, and the New North, in the present affair, than we have hitherto had. In a way of patient waiting, and humble supplications to heaven, Providence may possibly clear up the matters that are dark at present; so that all concerned may at last join in some issue that may be holy, peaceable, and comfortable. Patient and prayerful waiting is, therefore, what we think best at present, and what we advise you to; and also that you and your brethren, with whom you are dissatisfied, would take opportunities to confer together in a spirit of meekness, for the quieting and reconciling your spirits, that you may again be united in love as formerly. But, if conten-

tions and division should prevail, how greatly would it dishonor God, gratify the devil, grieve the godly, and hurt yourselves and others too!"

But the passions and prejudices of both parties had now become too warmly enlisted to suffer them to give heed to the instructions of Christian wisdom and love. The New North Church pushed matters to extremity, and appointed a day for the installation of Mr. Thacher. The Boston ministers signified their unwillingness to sit on the installing council. The day appointed for the installation arrived. The church in Milton, under the care of a relative of the candidate, and the church in Rumney Marsh, or Chelsea, under that of the Rev. Mr. Cheever, were the only churches represented on the council. Indeed, the former was not fairly represented at all, since it had voted not to give its assistance, and its pastor attended the council in opposition to its vote.

It should here be remarked, that on the evening previous to the day of installation, it being feared that some disturbance might arise, a letter was addressed to the party who felt themselves aggrieved, by the two Mathers, with the advice and concurrence of the other ministers, solemnly and earnestly beseeching them to conduct themselves on the morrow with moderation and decorum. "We earnestly inculcate upon you," says the epistle, "that ancient advice, 'Cease from anger and forsake wrath; fret not yourselves in anywise to do evil.' We particularly advise, exhort, and entreat you, that on the morrow you forbear and prevent every thing that may be of a riotous or too clamorous aspect; and let nothing be done but what shall

become sober Christians and the well-advised. And, whatsoever shall be spoke, let it be in the decent, modest, and peaceable manner which may adorn your profession of Christianity. Your cause will not be the worse for your observing a conduct entirely under the law of goodness." It is also worthy of notice, that, this letter being read to them, a great number of the dissentients agreed to comply with its advice. And, doubtless, they would have adhered to this good intention, if they had not been grievously exasperated by the organization and conduct of the council. How could they have been otherwise than sorely vexed, at finding so small a council—consisting of but two members, and only one of them present by the vote of his church—convened on so important an occasion, and evidently determined to thwart their wishes, and to carry on, at all risks, the solemn business of the day! In such a state of feeling as then existed, it was hardly to be expected that their indignation should not have been roused to the highest pitch. The consequences that followed were chargeable to the council more than to themselves. Nor were the council without anticipation of the disorders which were likely to ensue; for, being afraid of confusion and violence, if they passed through the public streets, they were led out through the back gate of Mr. Webb's garden (which covered the ground now occupied by the church at the corner of Salem and Bennet-streets), across Tileston-street, then called Love Lane, and through an alley which opens immediately in front of the New North Meeting-house; and thus were enabled, by stratagem, to obtain possession of the pulpit.

The tumultuous scene which followed their appearance in the church, I will not attempt to describe. The accounts of it which have come down to us have the appearance of great exaggeration. But the doings of men in an hour of excited passion conform to no rule. At such times, all ordinary standards of propriety and decency are liable to be set at nought, and all feeling of veneration forgotten; whilst even the consecrated altar, and the more solemn services of religion, may be profaned by those who, in their sober moments, would be the last to countenance an act of desecration. In the midst of the uproar, the Rev. Mr. Cheever, having gone through the usual ceremony of asking the votes of the church in confirmation of their choice of the candidate, and having heard his public acceptance of their call, proceeded to proclaim "the Rev. Peter Thacher to be the pastor of the New North Church, *regularly* inducted into the sacred office."

Such, my friends, is a brief sketch of the history of the difficulties which led to the building of this house. I have endeavored to relate it with perfect fairness. If I have stated the case too favorably on the side of the founders of the New Brick Church, it is not because I have wished to defend them by warping the truth, but because such is my deliberate judgment, formed after long and careful investigation of all the documents which I have been able to procure. That they were not free from undue passion in their conduct of the controversy, I have not denied. We cannot but regret that their cause was not managed with a better temper. But their opposition was based on principle; and the first impulse of their

movement was a conscientious scruple which commands respect.

Immediately after the settlement of Mr. Thacher, the dissentients withdrew, and adopted measures for erecting the building we now occupy. The number of the first associates was twenty-four. Their first meeting was held on the 14th of November, 1720; at which time it was "voted, that some of them should treat with Mr. Thomas Roby, of Cambridge, for the purchase of a certain tract or piece of land," a suitable lot for a church. These associates "advanced and paid for said land in equal proportion; which, with the charges arising on the same, amounted to twenty-three pounds ten shillings from each, or five hundred and sixty-four pounds." On the 12th of December, a building-committee of seven was chosen, "to agree with workmen to erect, build, and finish a brick house, suitable for the public worship of God, with all convenient speed and despatch, according to a plan offered to the society by Edward Pell," one of the committee. The same committee was also clothed with authority to admit sixteen more members into the society, upon payment of the same sum contributed by the original proprietors. The desired number of forty was soon complete. The house being finished, the forty proprietors assembled on the 5th of May for the choice of pews. The first choice was given to John Frisell and William Clark, "for their great good-will and benefactions to said work," then to the rest of the building committee, and then to the other proprietors, determined by lot. On the next day, the remainder of the pews on the lower floor were distributed by lot

amongst such buyers "as it had been thought for the interest of the society to allow to become their purchasers;" and, on the 8th of May, the same order was taken in regard to the distribution of the pews in the gallery.

The 10th of May, 1721, had been agreed upon for the dedication of the house, to be kept as a day of fasting and prayer, "to beg the smiles of Divine Providence on the proprietors, and all others that shall be concerned with them." Dr. Increase Mather was desired to preach the forenoon sermon on that occasion; but he excused himself by reason of his great age. He, however, consented to commence the morning services with prayer. A sermon followed from Cotton Mather, on the words of the tenth verse of the twenty-fourth Psalm: "Who is this King of Glory? The Lord of Hosts, he is the King of Glory." Dr. William Cooper, colleague pastor of Brattle-street, offered the concluding prayer. The exercises of the afternoon began with prayer by Dr. Benjamin Colman, of Brattle-street. Mr. Wadsworth, of the First Church, afterwards President of Harvard College, preached from Revelation, second chapter and first verse: "Unto the angel of the church of Ephesus, write: These things saith he that holdeth the seven stars in his right hand, who walketh in the midst of the golden candlesticks."

"The house," says Mr. Ware, "appears to have been regarded at that time, and for many years after, as a building of uncommon elegance and taste. The preacher expressed only the common opinion when he said, 'I suppose that there is not in all the land a more beautiful house built for the worship of God than this, whereof you

now appear to make a dedication unto the Lord. But what will it signify,' he added, 'if the beauty of holiness be not here?'"

The house, as we remember it, especially in the interior, gives but a faint idea of its original appearance. The pulpit stood in the middle of the north side. In front of it were two enclosures, one a little more elevated than the other, for the elders' and deacons' seats. On each side of the broad aisle, in front of the pews, were several long seats for the aged. The pews were square. There were two rows of galleries on the west side, one on the south, and one on the east. The last was called the "women's gallery;" and the others, the "men's." The only access to these galleries was by flights of stairs on the inside of the house. The upper gallery appears to have been but little used, except by boys, who sometimes resorted there to play during service; for which reason the entrance to it was most of the time kept closed, till the year 1808, when it was converted into a hall for social meetings and the use of the singers. A timepiece, the gift of Mr. Barret Dyre, in 1721, hung opposite to the pulpit, and kept its place till 1820, when it was replaced by another, through the liberality of the late Samuel Parkman, Esq.* The exterior of the house was not at first painted. The spire was without bell or dial. There were porches of entrance on the west, south, and east. The whole space in the rear of the church to what was then called Fore-street, now Ann-street, was vacant, and probably the ground was open for some distance on both sides; which, as the church

* See Appendix G.

occupies a small eminence, gave it at that period a commanding aspect.

The mode of conducting the public services was also very different from the present. The Scriptures were not read till the year 1729, when the proprietors "voted, that the Bible offered to the church by Captain Henry Deering, in order for the minister's reading or explaining, be accepted; and also that a committee be appointed to make choice of a convenient place for laying the Bible when made use of;" which last vote clearly shows, that the original pulpit was constructed in a different manner from the present. Another difference is indicated in the following vote, viz. "that Mr. John Waldo read the Psalm," — that is, line by line, — "and Mr. Moses Pearce set the tune, until further notice." It is probable that, at this period, there was ordinarily but one psalm sung in the course of each service; and, as there was no instrumental music and no reading of the Bible, what we have heard of the length of the sermons and the prayers, and of the patience of the hearers during the same, will appear the less surprising, as the whole time occupied by the worship could not have been much longer than in our own day.

A church was first gathered amongst the worshippers on the 22d day of May, 1722. The only creed which is attached to the covenant is of the very simplest and most general form, being embodied in these words: "We declare our serious belief of the Christian religion, as contained in the Sacred Scriptures." An acknowledgment of the doctrine of the Trinity is, however, implied in the phraseology of several of the obligations. The covenant is not lengthy,

being little more than an engagement to live a life of obedience to Christ, to love and watch over one another, and to keep all the ordinances of the gospel; with the addition of “an offering and presentation of their *seed* unto the Lord, and a promise to do their part in the methods of a religious education, so that their children also may be the Lord’s.”

The same day on which the church was gathered, William Waldron, the first pastor, was ordained. He had preached for some time as a candidate, in connection with Mr. Joshua Gee, afterwards pastor of the Old North Church. He was chosen on the 26th of September, 1721; having received fifty votes, and Mr. Gee thirteen. He was the last who received ordination at the hands of the venerable Increase Mather.

Mr. Waldron was a member of one of the most respectable and influential families in New Hampshire. He was son of Col. Richard Waldron, of Portsmouth, and grandson of Major Richard Waldron, of Dover,—the story of whose tragical end is one of the most affecting in the annals of our early Indian wars. He was born at Portsmouth on the 4th of November, 1697, and graduated at Harvard College in 1717. His ministry of only five years was too short to make full proof of his plans and capacities of usefulness; but few clergymen have been more affectionately commemorated by their professional associates. The library of our church contains a volume of sermons which were preached on the occasion of his death by the most celebrated of his compeers. In reading these, it is doubtless necessary to make considerable allowance for the naturally exaggerated encomiums of warm personal friend-

ship, and freshly excited sympathy. But, when this is done to the fullest extent, there remains indubitable evidence that the character of the first minister of the New Brick Church was of more than ordinary worth. To a finished education was superadded the still more excellent qualification for the ministry, the grace of early piety. His most intimate friend, Dr. Cooper, dwells particularly upon this characteristic, and illustrates it by a brief anecdote which has so much of the savor of that old time that I am tempted to repeat it. "In his early childhood," says Dr. Cooper, "a particular Providence set the wheel of prayer a-going, and I believe it never wholly stopped afterwards. This he once gave me an account of in a retired conversation, and I suppose I was the only person to whom he mentioned it. His dear parents were gone somewhere by water, when a storm arose with sudden gusts of wind, when it was supposed they were returning home. The little boy heard his family speak of the danger they might be in. This so alarmed his fear, that he went away alone to seek God in their behalf, and pray that they might be preserved and returned in safety. And, having begun thus successfully to pray for his parents, he afterwards continued to pray for himself. I also know," said he, "that, while at college, he was one of those young students who used to meet on the evening of the Lord's day, for prayer and other exercises of social religion."

As a preacher, he was remarkable for soundness of argument, plainness and directness of speech, and gravity of manner. His temper was naturally obliging, and his affections warm; whilst, at the same time, he was too inde-

pendent to stoop to any little acts to conciliate favor, and too stern in integrity ever to prostitute his conscience. He was, like most of the clergymen of New England, a hearty patriot, and a steady friend and advocate of all the civil privileges which the people then enjoyed. He was also a strict and very zealous Congregationalist. If he had lived longer, there is no doubt that he would have exerted a powerful influence in the community, and have left more conspicuous memorials upon the records of this church. But Providence had another destiny in store for him. His death took place on the 11th of September, 1727. "He died," says Cotton Mather, "nobly. So to die is indeed no dying. 'Tis but flying away, with the wings of the morning, into the paradise of God." *

Mr. William Welsteed was chosen successor of Mr. Waldron, on the 16th of January, 1727. He was born in Boston in 1695. He had been a tutor at the college for several years, and appears to have attracted some notice as a preacher before his invitation to settle over this church. I find it stated in a century sermon, delivered at Weston, by Dr. Samuel Kendall, in 1813, that Mr. Welsteed received a call to be the minister of the church in that town, in August, 1722. He had also preached with much approbation, as a candidate, at Portsmouth. It is somewhat singular, in relation to his preaching at the latter place, that several letters have been preserved, and are now in my possession, from our first pastor, Mr. Waldron, to his brother Richard, in Portsmouth, in which he speaks of Mr. Welsteed in the following terms: "He is a good man, and

* See Appendix H.

true; a good scholar, a good preacher, and a gentlemanly man, I am sooth to say; but, all things considered, I don't think he would suit Portsmouth so well as some others." He alludes here to Professor Wigglesworth, to whom he was devotedly attached, and whom he used all his efforts to have chosen by the society in Portsmouth, of which his brother was one of the most influential members. †

Mr. Welsted continued the sole minister of this church for about ten years, when Mr. Ellis Gray was unanimously chosen to the office of colleague-pastor. He was son of Mr. Edward Gray, who, in early life, came over from England to this country; and, by industry and integrity, amassed a considerable fortune,—a man eminently charitable and universally esteemed, to whose virtues and beneficence a high tribute remains, in a funeral sermon, preached by Mr. Chauncy on the occasion of his death.

Mr. Welsted and Mr. Gray were both of them men of respectable talents, but in no respect remarkably distinguished. They lived harmoniously together in the discharge of their professional duties, and fulfilled a plain and useful ministry. I can add nothing to the record which Mr. Ware has given of the history of the church whilst under their charge. "It was at this period that our Friday evening lecture before the communion was established, and the old custom was dropped of singing by the separate reading of each line. In 1751, Watts's Psalms and Hymns were introduced in the worship of the sabbath, and continued in use until superseded by Belknap's Collection in 1817, a period of sixty-six years."

† See Appendix I.

Mr. Welsteed's true character is doubtless depicted by one of his contemporaries, who said of him, that he was an excellent Christian, an accomplished gentleman, and exemplary minister; amiable and engaging in his conduct, and lovely in his temper; living a benevolent, gracious, and useful life. Mr. Gray is described as a man of candor, prudence, and sincerity; of solid judgment and warm heart; peculiarly fitted for the whole of his sacred office; of clear and pathetic elocution, and of uncommon command of devotional sentiment in his prayers; honest and firm in his principles, kind and obliging to all, and universally respected by the friends of piety and virtue.

“The circumstances attending the death of these two ministers were remarkable and melancholy. Gray, the junior pastor, died suddenly of the palsy, on the Lord's day, January 7, 1753, in the thirty-seventh year of his age, and the fifteenth of his ministry. His senior colleague survived him not quite four months. He died on the 29th of April, having been also struck with the palsy in church, on Sunday, just after the commencement of his morning prayer; having lived fifty-seven years, and been minister twenty-five. Here was the melancholy spectacle of a church in mourning for two pastors at once; both cut off suddenly in the midst of life. And, to render the visitation yet more affecting, they both died of the same disease, both died on the sabbath, both on the communion-sabbath, and both at the same time of the day; each having preached for the last time to his own people, and the last sermon preached by both being on the same text, ‘Redeeming the time because the days are evil.’” *

* Mr. Ware's Century Sermon.

Before proceeding with our record, it may be useful to take a brief survey of the religious aspects of the community, during the thirty years which had now elapsed since the gathering of the New Brick Church.

At that period, Boston enjoyed the labors of an eminently pious and learned ministry. Cotton Mather, in his peculiar style, in allusion to this fact, exclaims, "O city, highly favored of the Lord! how canst thou be too thankful for such inestimable blessings! The whole country will feel the sweet influences of more than seven stars that irradiate its metropolis." Notwithstanding, however, the sweet influences of these luminaries, it is sufficiently evident that there was but little religious life manifested in the churches. There were, indeed, general complaints amongst pious and elderly persons, of a great decay of godliness; and expressions of discouragement at the religious and moral declension of the community were frequent on the lips of the clergy. In this state of things, all the usual, and many unusual, methods were resorted to, to produce one of those "revivals of religion," which, in those days, as well as in our own, were held by many in the highest esteem. All these efforts, however, appear to have met with very little success, until the year 1727, when an event occurred, which, under the management of zealous religionists, was well calculated to produce the desired effect. On the night of Sunday, Oct. 29th, in this year, the whole country was visited with a violent shock of an earthquake, the sound and shaking of which are described as having been terrific at Boston, and to have carried the greatest consternation to the inhabitants, who were roused

from their sleep by such an unusual and startling phenomenon. On the next day, and for several succeeding days, the churches were crowded; and, by the proclamation of the commander-in-chief, a day of fasting and prayer was appointed, to supplicate the merey of God, and especially the "conversion of the people." As may well be supposed, a great religious excitement was the result of these measures, and many were awakened and added to the churches. But, with the subsiding of the alarm, the interest also soon passed away; and the historian of the times, who was himself a friend to such excitements, is compelled in fairness to confess, that the professions of many were but as the morning cloud and the early dew.*

Things continued in about the same condition until the year 1740, when many of the ministry, having heard from across the ocean the fame of the success which followed the preaching of the renowned George Whitefield, sent him an invitation to visit this country. In compliance with their request, he arrived in Boston, on his first visit, in the month of September, 1740. The people flocked in crowds to hear him. Ministers, as well as their congregations, were powerfully impressed by his preaching. Meetings were multiplied. A universal awakening ensued, and multitudes were added to many of the churches. The pastors of this church were not unfriendly to these proceedings, though they appear to have taken no very active interest or conspicuous part in them. The records of that period are very imperfect, and it is impossible to determine with accuracy how far this church was affected by the

* Prince's Christian History.

general increase. It is, however, perfectly clear that the congregation passed with steadiness and dignity through the dissensions and agitations which attended and followed that period of unprecedented excitement. With prudent and moderate men at the helm of its affairs, if it did not enjoy, to the same degree with some others, the good and valuable fruits of the great awakening, neither did it greatly suffer from its extravagancies and ill effects. For a sober review of that interesting period of our ecclesiastical history will easily lead us to the conclusion, that in this, as in all other seasons of extraordinary excitement, the good was not unmixed with evil, and that much of what was gained to the interests of true Christianity by an increase of fervor was lost to the same by a diminution of charity, moderation, and discretion.

In relation to the affairs of the church during the period of which we are speaking, a few particulars only require our notice, in addition to what has been already related.

The interests of the society had been generally in a prosperous condition. The congregation was rent by no intestine divisions. The ancient feud with its neighbor and mother, the New North, had been healed, and well-nigh forgotten. The greatest attachment had been felt to its three pastors, and every mark of attention and respect that they could have desired had been shown to them. In their lives, they were repeatedly furnished with help in the supply of the pulpit, even for months at a time, and were gratified with valuable presents of wood and money, in addition to their regular stipend. In their sickness, the

church had variously ministered to their comfort, and kept days of fasting and prayer for their recovery; and, when they died, their funeral obsequies were performed at the charge of the parish, with demonstrations of unfeigned respect; and their names were cherished in grateful remembrance. Indeed, it is particularly and emphatically said in the obituary notices of Waldron, that "the great and exemplary respect" shown by this society to their minister "deserved to be everywhere told as a memorial of them."

The house, moreover, had been several times repaired, and gradually beautified. A bell had been hung in its tower, and its walls handsomely painted. And every thing within and without the building presented an appearance indicative of the good condition of the parish, and gratifying to all who loved the place where God's honor dwelleth.*

Nearly a year elapsed after the death of Mr. Welsteed, before the appointment of a successor. The unanimous choice of the church, and a very large vote of the congregation, selected for this office the Rev. Ebenezer Pemberton, whose installation took place on the 6th of March, 1754.

Mr. Pemberton was son of an eminent clergyman, of the same name, who was for many years pastor of the Old South Church. In the earlier part of his life, he had been chaplain at Castle William. In April, 1727, he had received an invitation from the First Presbyterian Church in New York to settle as their minister, with the request that he should be ordained in Boston. Accord-

* See Appendix J.

ingly, his ordination took place on the 9th of August, in that year; from which period he resided in New York, in the charge of the above-named church, for twenty-two years. Of the manner in which he discharged his duties in that city, I find the most honorable mention made in Smith's History of New York. It is there said of him, that he was a man of polite breeding, pure morals, and warm devotion; under whose incessant labors the congregation greatly increased, and was enabled to erect a spacious church in 1748. But, on account of trifling contentions, kindled by the bigotry and ignorance of the lower sort of people, he at length requested his dismissal. There is preserved on our records a copy of a letter from the Presbytery of New York, signed by the father of the late Aaron Burr, as moderator, conveying the most honorable testimony of the Presbytery to Mr. Pemberton's "ministerial dignity, abilities, and success, and their cheerful recommendation of him as an eminently endowed and highly esteemed preacher."

As soon as this society heard of his intention to leave New York, they became eager to engage his services, as he was regarded at that time a gifted and powerful preacher. At the period of his settlement here, he enjoyed a degree of popularity such as had fallen to the lot of few who had ever stood in a Boston pulpit, and attracted to this house a crowded congregation. But he lived to experience, even beyond what is usual in such cases, the proverbial fickleness of popular favor. In the latter part of his life, his congregation sadly dwindled. Instead of the throngs which used to gather before him, his eye looked

down upon only a few familiar faces scattered about amongst almost empty pews. But the declension of his fame was not more attributable to any deterioration of his ability, than to the influence of political odium. The inhabitants of the North End, as is well known, were almost all of them stanch and uncompromising whigs. Dr. Pemberton was a warm friend of Governor Hutchinson, who was a worshipper at his church, and therefore fell under the suspicion of sharing his attachment to the tory interest. For this reason, doubtless, some of his congregation left him.

As the war of the Revolution approached, Dr. Pemberton's health declined, and the condition of his parish became feeble and discouraging. At no other period in its history were its affairs at so low an ebb. Efforts were made to settle a colleague who might redeem the credit of the church, — but in vain. Several distinguished young men were selected as candidates; — amongst others, Mr. Buckminster, the father of the lamented Buckminster of Boston, and Mr. Isaac Story, afterwards of Marblehead.* The former was most agreeable to Dr. Pemberton; the latter, to his parishioners. But the troubles of the year 1775 put an end to all the proceedings of the society. At the close of the month of April in that year, the inhabitants generally left Boston, and this house was closed.

The desecration of several of our churches by the British, during the blockade of Boston, is a matter of history, with which you are familiar. Whilst the Old North was demolished, the Old South turned into a circus, and

* See Appendix K.

the steeple of the West Church torn down, no violence was offered to the New Brick ; partly, it may be, for the reason, that its pastor had given no cause of offence to his country's enemies, and that its most distinguished worshipper was their ally and friend.

Dr. Pemberton resided, during the siege, at Andover. His health had been for some time feeble, and his pulpit had been supplied for several months before he left the town. Indeed, he had, for a long time previous, generously relinquished his salary, and, from the beginning of February, 1774, never received any thing from the parish. I cannot ascertain, that, after the evacuation of the town, he ever appeared in the pulpit. It is probable that his increasing infirmities prevented him even from attending worship. No notice is made of him at this time on our records ; nor have I been able to ascertain any thing more concerning the circumstances of his death, than is contained in a single sentence in an old newspaper: "On Tuesday morning last, September 9, 1779, departed this life, after a long confinement, the Rev. Dr. Pemberton ; his funeral to be attended this P.M. at three o'clock." His connection with the society was never formally dissolved, but gradually loosened, till at length it existed merely in name.*

But I cannot dismiss this brief notice of the ministry of Dr. Pemberton, without allusion to a single circumstance, which is of too gratifying a nature not to be commemorated on this occasion. The neighboring Baptist society, then under the charge of Dr. Stillman, in the spring of 1771, being about to build a new church, made

* See Appendix L.

application for the use of the house belonging to our ancestors, till such time as their own should be fit for worship. The request was unanimously and most cordially granted ; and, from June till December of that year, the two congregations worshipped together, the pastors of both officiating by turns. The texts, both of the first and last of Dr. Stillman's sermons, have been preserved on our records, with strong commendation of the discourses. What volumes of Christian sentiment do these texts convey ! Would that their spirit had never been departed from by the succeeding members of either or of any denomination ! His subject, on coming into the pulpit, was this, " Behold how good and pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity ! " and, on taking leave of it, " Finally, brethren, farewell. Be of one mind ; live in peace, and the God of love and peace shall be with you. " I mention this incident with the greater pleasure, by reason of the recent and very friendly offer of hospitality which has been extended to ourselves from the descendants of those whom our fathers so cordially entertained. How beautiful are even the smallest acts of brotherly kindness, in the midst of the party divisions and sectarian prejudices which occupy so large a space in the religious history of our age ! Our early records have no fairer page than that which is adorned with this wreath of love. And never, I believe, has the great Head of the church looked down upon this temple with a more approving smile, than when those two venerable ministers sat side by side in its pulpit, and their congregations were intermingled in its pews.*

* See Appendix M.

I have now brought down the history of the New Brick Church to the period when it was incorporated with the Second, as recorded in the first part of this book. The bell of the Old North Church, which was larger than that of the New Brick, was hung in its place. A part of the communion-service of silver, belonging to the Second Church, as also their land and other property, which had become useless, together with the old bell of the New Brick, were sold to purchase a parsonage-house for Dr. Lathrop. The large Bible of the Old North was presented to the Second Church in Newton.

The New Brick continued to be occupied by the Second Church till 1844. On Sunday, March 11, services were held in it for the last time. A few paragraphs from the farewell sermons then preached, referring to the old edifice, and showing the feelings with which it was regarded, and the condition of the society at that period, are here added as matters of historical interest.

The sermons were from the text, Psalm xlviii. 12, 13: "Walk about Zion, and go round about her; tell the towers thereof. Mark ye well her bulwarks, consider her palaces; that ye may tell it to the generation following." The subject was introduced as follows:—

We meet to-day for the last time in this venerable house. It has stood a hundred and twenty-three years. It is the oldest temple in this city. Christ Church, its ancient neighbor, is its junior by more than two years, and the Old South by nearly nine.* It has been an object of

* The corner-stone of Christ Church was laid April 15, 1723. It was first opened for worship on the 29th of December, of the same year. The

sacred interest to many generations. Its image has been connected with the idea of God, in the minds of myriads who have been born and lived and died within sight of its spire. Hallowed associations gather thickly around it. Its walls are hung with the memorials of ancient days. Shadowy processions of the sainted dead seem to move along its aisles; and a solemn chant, as of many voices, known and unknown, mingling in psalms and prayers, to swell beneath its roof.

It is a serious thing to demolish a house like this. It is a solemn act to destroy these time-hallowed walls. It is more, far more, than merely to take down the material pile, which hands, long since mouldered to dust, assisted to raise. These stones and bricks are inwrought with holy sentiments; they are inscribed with honored names; they are written all over with religious reminiscences; they enshrine venerated images; they are memorials of the piety and faith of our fathers; they are largely and intimately connected with the spiritual life of past and present generations. We may replace them with a more splendid edifice. We may tax architectural art for all the elements of grandeur and beauty it can furnish, to decorate the structure which is to be reared upon their ruins. But the sentiments and affections which consecrate this ancient house, no human skill can restore. A sacred, a spiritual fabric of hallowed memories and associations will be shattered together with these crumbling walls, — and fall never to rise again.

foundation of the Old South was commenced March 31, 1729. Religious services were attended in it for the first time on the 27th of April, 1730.

But every thing must yield to the immediate wants and will of the living. The command of present *use* is in our day incontrovertible and supreme. Its sceptre sways everywhere. The marks of its empire are all around us. It takes down and builds up, and knows no veneration. The sacred and the beautiful are continually bowing before it. It has often pointed ominously at this old edifice. It has touched it now, and to-morrow it falls.

But it shall not fall unhonored. This old pile shall not be swept away for ever from the sight of men, without a becoming commemoration of its long and interesting history. The rude hammer shall not strike its first blow against its walls, until our hearts have paid to it their parting tribute of affection and respect. We will not meet for the last time at this beloved and venerated altar, without such a valedictory service as it deserves from those who have gathered around it on so many hallowed occasions with gratitude and devotion, and found under its shade the peace of heaven.

The condition of the society, and the peculiar impressions of the occasion, were thus noticed in the close of the second discourse :—

We have passed together through changeful times ; through various periods of great and wide-spread excitement ; through powerful agitations of opinion ; whilst, within the borders of our own little community, we have been blessed with uninterrupted peace, and not a single jar has disturbed our sabbath-home. All the concerns of the parish have been managed with commendable fidelity and wisdom on the part of those who have been entrusted with

their charge. The number of our proprietors and worshippers has increased. Accessions to the church have been of late greatly multiplied. New manifestations of social feeling and of spiritual life have strengthened our union, and refreshed our hearts. And now, through all the perplexities and differences with which the question of demolishing this old house of worship, and building a new, has been necessarily involved, we find ourselves sitting together for the last time around this beloved altar, with no sentiments, I hope and believe, which are uncharitable towards each other, or uncongenial with the spirit of peace and love.

I cannot express the satisfaction and the gratitude I feel at the condition of this parish in these last hours of our occupancy of this old temple. How sad, how bitterly reproachful, would be our reflections, if we were leaving it in discord and confusion and weakness! How deep and stinging would be our consciousness of shame, if, after all the pious multitudes whose care has preserved it to our hands, and whose prayers have consecrated it to our hearts, we were now compelled to feel that the years of our possession of it, the last years of its existence, had been stained with unworthy dissensions, and disgraced with faithlessness and neglect! Thanks, thanks be to God that we are spared such misery as that! Thanks that we leave it in no worse spiritual or temporal condition, as a society, than when it came into our hands! Thanks that its walls do not come down because we are a dwindling congregation, without heart or ability to repair the dilapidations of time! Thanks that it does not crumble around us because we are indiffer-

ent or dead!—but rather because we are straitened by its bounds, and feel the stirrings of a growing life, which, in the order of Providence, prompts us to throw off its walls that a more spacious and beautiful structure may rise up in their stead.

Yet let there be no boastful nor ambitious feeling in our hearts. A more consistent emotion is that of wonder at the long-suffering mercy of our God. “My soul shall make her boast in the Lord. Not unto us, O Lord! not unto us, but unto thy name, give glory” for thy great compassion and forbearance towards us. For how poor have been our best offerings! how cold our warmest prayers! When we consider how many hallowed hours we have spent in these courts, what voices have here addressed us, what vows we have made, we cannot certainly go out for the last time over that threshold with any other than a lowly step and a contrite heart. May God in his mercy pardon all our offences, and the offences of our fathers, that have ever defiled this sacred place; all formal worship; all unbrotherly sentiments; all comings before him with mind polluted, and heart unsanctified; all worldly thoughts that have mingled with our devotions; all evil hearts of unbelief; all grievings of his Spirit; all liftings-up of the soul unto vanity; all high looks and proud hearts; all mockings at his mighty word; all stubborn impenitence and resistings of his grace: for verily we have not always honored him with our sacrifices, but have too often wearied him with our iniquities.

But I should do injustice, no less to my own feelings than to those to whom this society has stood most deeply

indebted, if I were to finish this sketch of our history without respectful and honorable allusion to those excellent men who, from generation to generation, have held up the hands of the ministers and stood as the pillars of this church. Time would fail me to enumerate them all, — though every one of their names is worthy of being registered in our remembrance. At the head of these stands Deacon John Tudor, — a man of no less sincere piety than sterling honor; prudent in affairs, and systematic in all his arrangements. His labors for the good of the society, during his own day, were various and indefatigable. Nor was he unmindful of the benefit of those who should come after him. Nearly all the most valuable records of the church and society, during the eighteenth century, were fully and carefully kept by himself. If it were not for his careful and untiring pen, nearly the whole of the ministry of Welsted, Gray, and Pemberton, would have been to us but little better than a blank. He was also a pecuniary benefactor of the society, and treasurer for about forty-two years. In the same connection should here be recorded the long and valuable services of Deacon Samuel Parkman, whose loss to this society was deeply lamented, and whose many claims to its respect and gratitude received, at his withdrawal, heartfelt and substantial testimonials.*

I would gladly prolong the catalogue, even to our own day. I would gladly marshal before you the whole procession of the stanch friends and supporters of this house, from its erection to its fall. There is not one of them whose memory I do not bless. There is not one who has

* See Appendix N.

done it good, or prayed for its peace, whom I do not thank and love. And especially do I, on this day, recall with renewed affection and gratitude the images of every one who, since the beginning of my own humble ministry, has lent his aid to the furtherance of God's holy work, or contributed to the honor and strength of this beloved congregation. The dead live in my remembrance, and the living shall never die from it. I feel their value now. I feel it every day. May God multiply to our society and our church the number of such wise and faithful men,—men who will stand by the altar, and lend their shoulders to the ark,—men who will love the very gates and walls of our Zion, for the sake of God and Christ, to whom our temples are consecrated, and for the precious interests of man's immortal nature and social well-being, of which they are the watch-towers, the nurseries, and the garrisons, from age to age.

And now, my friends, before this ancient landmark is removed out of its place, let us contemplate the lessons which it is calculated to impress upon the thoughtful mind. What changes have taken place around it since it first occupied this spot! what revolutions in this country and in the world! what mutations of opinion, of government, and of social life! what transformations on the face of the earth! what convulsions of empires! But the *institutions and ordinances of the gospel* still abide unshaken,—often attacked, but ever unharmed; in one period apparently sinking into neglect; at another, renewing their hold upon the reverence and affections of men; always striking their roots deeper into the heart of humanity, and spreading

them wider beneath the foundations of society, from the agitations which heave, and the convulsions that overthrow the things that can be shaken; and always rising serene and majestic from the mists which obscure, and the floods which threaten to overwhelm them. *Confidence, calm, entire confidence in their perpetuity*, is a lesson which I read, as if it were inscribed in characters of light upon this hoary pile.

Even within our own day, we have seen the popular tendency apparently setting strongly away from the institutions which our fathers loved. But we are also seeing the tide of opinion in our churches flowing back again with a fuller swell. It is a cause of heartfelt satisfaction, that no page in the records of this church affords such numerous evidences of devoted attachment to the ordinances of the gospel as the very last, and that similar indications are manifested in nearly all our churches. I believe it admits of demonstration, that at no period since the foundation of this house was laid, has the sabbath been more generally and properly honored, houses of worship more largely frequented, the Lord's Supper more fully attended, and the interests of true religion in a more promising condition in New England, than at the present hour. And why, but in part for the attacks which the institutions of Christianity have in recent times sustained? Why, but because the very progress of intellectual light, whilst it has dispersed much of the superstition with which they have been surrounded, has displayed more clearly to the illuminated mind their intrinsic advantages and claims? Why, but for the very reasons which, a few years ago,

awakened our apprehensions,—the onset of Rationalism, and the mistaken opposition of partial reformers? We have made trial of what Philosophy and Rationalism can do for our spiritual edification; and we have seen and felt the end of their perfection. We have proved the word and the power of those who would have persuaded us that the world has outgrown the holy ordinances of the gospel, and would have given us in their stead a religion altogether spiritual and imaginary,—disconnected from the pillars and the corner-stone of the visible church, which God, through his Son, has set up for the landmarks and bulwarks, and centre of union of the faithful, to the end of time. But the voices of these charmers, charm they ever so wisely, though they have beguiled many for a season, have not had the authoritative and divine tone of Him who spake as never man spake, nor can speak. The porter of the heart openeth not the door of its inner sanctuary, save to the true Shepherd. His sheep hear his voice, and follow him; but a stranger will they not follow, for they know not the voice of strangers. And though for a time they may wander away from the fold of safety, after one calling sweetly from the tops of some cloud-covered mountain, or another piping musically in the enchanted fields of unrestraint; yet, having wandered up and down, and near and far, seeking rest and finding none,—by and by, they will hear the voice of their forsaken Saviour, floating through the shades of night that are gathering thickly around them, as he calls his wanderers home, with that well-known cry of resistless tenderness, “Come unto me, all ye that are weary and heavy-laden, and I will give you rest;” and

their tired feet will turn back to the pale of peace, to go astray no more. And so it will be through the ages that are to come. Ever hath the seeking sparrow found a house, and ever will the wandering swallow find a nest for herself, where she may lay her young, even thine altars, O Lord of Hosts, my King and my God!

Another lesson is imprinted upon my soul with the image of this venerable structure, a lesson of *hope for the generations that are to come*, — glad hope for the unfolding destiny of mankind. For what progress has society made since the corner-stone of this edifice was laid! That “more light,” of which the sainted Robinson prophesied, as he turned his calm and pure eye towards the glorious visions of the spiritual morning which God showed him to be about to break across the dark waters of the Western Ocean, has already broken upon these latter days. If one of those ancient men of God who watched the rising of these walls were to come back and mingle with ourselves who are about to take them down, what astonishment would strike him dumb! what gratitude, too strong for utterance, would swell in his heart! The battle of political and religious freedom, which he anticipated would by and by come on, and to which he looked forward with such anxious expectations, has already hopefully commenced. The seeds of reforms which he planted have sprung up. The prayers which he breathed for the generations to come, the things which he waited for, but never found, are hastening to their fulfilment in our day, and beginning to be revealed to our babes. And we and our children, if we are but faithful to the mighty trust of the most glorious

present which the world has yet seen, may turn our faces forward with a still more hopeful gaze, and expect that, ere the new temple which we are about to rear shall crumble with age, or be exchanged for a more spacious and beautiful house, its turrets shall be gilded by a yet more glorious light, and its worshippers rejoice in a yet more perfect manifestation of the kingdom of Heaven on earth.

And now, my friends, the time has come for us to take our last farewell of this beloved house. It is hard to realize that we shall never meet in it again; that the delightful and hallowed hours we have spent under its roof are ended, and shall never be renewed. It is painful to think, that, when another sabbath dawns upon the earth, our eyes shall seek in vain for its glittering spire, and our steps turn slowly and sadly to some other temple. But we have not parted from it without long consideration. We do not leave it without a pious regret.

Farewell, then, a long, a fond, an eternal farewell to its sacred walls! Farewell, house of our fathers, and of our fathers' God! Lovely and dear and venerable has been thy hoary image to our eyes, nor shall it ever be effaced from our memories. Thy sacred uses are ended. Thy work of piety is done. The last echoes of our prayers are lingering amidst thy arches. The last incense of our worship is ascending around thy altar. Sink, then, to the dust! Fade for ever from our sight! Fall, crumble, and pass away! The temple of the Holy Ghost remaineth. The spiritual house that we have builded to God in our hearts abides unshaken. The sentiments that have conse-

crated thy courts shall flourish when the earth and the heavens are no more.

And yet, thanks be to God, not all that belongs to this house is destined to pass away. The sacred vessels that have contained the emblems of our Saviour's love, and that have so often been spread before us here, will go with us, and attend us, and welcome us again, by the grace of God, before another altar, and under the shadows of other walls. By this beautiful bond of union, our two sabbath-homes will be connected together,—the home of our remembrance be linked to the home of our hope. Let this, then, my beloved flock, be emblematical of the strength of our fellowship, and the spirit of our union and intercourse, till, by the blessing of Heaven, we meet at length with new songs of gratitude, and new purposes of piety, to consecrate the house that we are about to build to the God of Holiness and of Love.

A P P E N D I X.

A P P E N D I X.

A. — PAGE 7.

C O V E N A N T.

WE, whose names are here subscribed, being called of God to enter into church-fellowship together, knowing and considering our great unworthiness and unfitness for so near approaches to so holy a God, and how apt we are to start aside from him and from the rules of his gospel and government over us, — we therefore lament, as in his sight, the inconstancy of our own spirits with him, and our former neglects of him and pollutions of his house and holy things, by our personal corruptions and unholy walkings, and do beseech him, for his name's sake, to prevent us with mercy and accept us under the wings of his own everlasting covenant; and in dependence upon his free grace therein, in his name and strength, we here freely this day, in the presence of the ever-living God, do avouch the Lord to be our God, and ourselves to be his people, and do yield ourselves to him, by an holy covenant of faith and love and loyalty, to cleave to him and to one another in him; to cleave to God in Christ as our sovereign Good, and to the Lord Jesus Christ as the only Mediator and surety of the covenant, as our only high-priest and atonement to satisfy for us and to save us, and as our only prophet to guide and to teach us, and as our only king and lawgiver to reign over us; as also to attend upon him and the service of his holy will, by walking together as a congregation and church of Christ, in all the ways of his worship, and of mutual love, and of special watchfulness one over another, according to his will, which is revealed to us by his word; subjecting ourselves to the Lord in all his holy administrations in his church, beseeching him to own us for his people, and to delight to dwell among us as his people, that his kingdom and grace may be advanced by us.

Which sacred covenant that we may observe and all the branches of it inviolable for ever, we desire to deny ourselves, and to depend alone

upon the power of his Spirit, and upon the merits and mercies of the Lord Jesus Christ, for assistance and for acceptance, for healing and forgiving mercy for his own sake.

In witness whereof, we have set to our hands. [Signed by the seven brethren named in page 7.]

B. — PAGE 9.

(From Mass. Historical Society's Collections.)

TO THE HONOURED GOVERNOUR AND MAGISTRATES.

Michael Powell, your humble servant, desires you of your clemency to read these few lines.

When the providence of the Almighty settled me in Boston, I intended to join with that church : but, finding that myself and wife did give offence in crowding into their seats that were former inhabitants, I endeavoured by the elders to be directed where we might sit without offence ; but they not finding any spare room, and the new meeting-house being built, and myself being invited to join with others to gather a church, which was done by the advice and approbation of the Rev. Mr. Cotton and Mr. Wilson : we all not doubting but Mr. Samuel Mather would have joined in office with us, as he pretended : but, he failing us, we were not wanting to seek for supply elsewhere, as your worships know. Meanwhile, finding that it was burthensome to the elders constantly to supply the place, and oft the place was not supplied, myself (unworthy) being called of the brethren, thought I was called of God to improve my one talent,—with this promise to the church, that I would supply the place but when or till we could not [be] better supplied otherwise, which we still endeavoured. Now, honoured in the Lord, I, finding assistance and acceptance far beyond deserts or expectation, went on ; my chief encouragement being some fruit that some professed they reaped by my poor labors. Now the brethren, being out of other hopes, motioned calling me to office ; a strange motion to me. So they gave me a call. I desired time to consider of it, meanwhile seeking for guidance from the Lord. I did think there was a finger of God in it, which I durst not deny, though weak and unworthy, yet knowing who had all power. I accepted of the call, I say, with much fear and trembling, upon these terms, that if the magistrates and elders did approve and consent thereunto. Now, finding that the then honoured General Court did advise us to forbear, we were satisfied and fully resolved to follow that advice. I not forward to take such a charge upon me, hence the injunction of the County Court was sad unto me. Now, honoured in the Lord, I hearing that some reports are come to your ears, that we intend to proceed, notwithstanding court or county ; it is no small sadness to my spirit that it should be so thought or spoken. Such

a thing never yet entered into my thoughts, nor words into my ears; if any such words have dropt from any, 'tis more than I know. God forbid I should be cause of any disturbance in the country. I have not so learned Christ. By help from God, I will study peace and follow it. I had rather be followed to my grave than unto that which crosses the rule of Christ, or disturbs the peace of the churches.

Honoured fathers of this commonwealth, my humble request is that you would not have such hard thoughts of me, that I would consent to be ordained to office without your concurrence; nor that our poor church would attempt such a thing without your approbation; but that under you we may still (as we have) live a quiet life in godliness and honesty. Thus desiring your favourable aspect, humbly desiring pardon of my boldness, desiring the Lord to guide you and prosper all your pious endeavours for the peace of this commonwealth and for our poor orphan church, I shall ever be at your worships' command in the Lord.

MICHAEL POWELL.

Received 6 September, 1653.

C. — PAGE 47.

It was my purpose to have taken up in this Appendix all the charges that have been brought against Increase Mather, to have examined minutely the grounds on which they rest, and to have answered them one by one. The materials with which I have furnished myself are, as I think, abundantly sufficient for his defence and justification. My book, however, is swelling to such a size that I am compelled to be contented with what has been said in the body of the work in vindication of his character. No notice has been taken of the accusation against Increase Mather, that he was instrumental in creating or fostering "the witchcraft madness," for the simple reason that it is entirely groundless. The evidence is abundant and perfectly clear to the fact of his having not only been guiltless of producing, but influential in allaying it, and in opening the eyes of his contemporaries to the mischief and dangers that attended it.

I omitted to mention that he died August 23, 1723. His disorder was that painful malady which formerly afflicted so many students and aged clergymen, — the stone.

D. — PAGE 81.

WILL OF REV. INCREASE MATHER, 7 (4), 1718.

I Increase Mather of Boston in New England, being not only sensible that I am (as all men are) a poor mortal ; but having moreover, in respect of some bodily Infirmities, (especially that Ephialtes which I have often bin afflicted with) Reason to think that my Breath will suddenly be stopped ; so that it is possible & probable that, when dying, I shall not have Liberty to express my Mind. And considering that God, of his abundant Mercy, has given me to accomplish those Things, which when sick near unto Death many Years ago I desired Life and Health that I might finish : I would be in a Readiness, that, when CHRIST shall call for me, I may have nothing else to do, but to dy and go to HIM. And withal remembering, that it is according to the Will of God, that a Man before his Death set his House in Order ; I do make & appoint this to be my last Will & Testament in Manner following :

Concerning my Soul, I have long since (even from my Youth for more than threescore Years ago) given it to God in JESUS CHRIST ; trusting that HE, who has the Keys of Hell & Death, will command His holy Angels to conduct me into his Blessed Presence, when once Death has separated between my mortal Body & my immortal Spirit. I am the Chief of Sinners, and have nothing in the World to depend upon but only the Righteousness of JESUS CHRIST ; and the Remembrance of that Righteousness does make me to triumph not only over Death and Devils, but over all my Sins. When my Soul is out of my Body, let my dear LORD JESUS CHRIST do what HE will with it ; for into his Hands do I commit my Spirit. If He will send that Soul, which He has redeemed with His own Blood, and which He has made above all Things desirous to glorify his Name, If He will send that Soul down into Eternal Darkness, I am then content to perish ; but that can never be.

Concerning my Body, I commit it to the Earth, there to Sleep in Hope, until the Resurrection of the Just.

As to the outward Estate which the LORD of His Goodness has bestowed upon me, It is my Mind & Will (and I trust the Will of God also) that it be disposed of as follows.

I would in the first Place give Order for the Payment of my Debts, if I had any : but I bless the LORD I owe no man any Thing but Love. I give five Pounds to the Poor in that Church to which I am related.

Concerning my Wife that now is, there was an Agreement before Marriage, and Writings signed accordingly, that I should not be concerned with any Part of her Estate, nor She with mine. If She shall (as hitherto

She has not) bring any Thing to me, I would have it returned to her again with double the Value.

Concerning my Son Cotton Mather, He has bin a great Comfort to me from his Childhood, having bin a very dutiful Son, and a singular Blessing to his Father's Family and Flock. If I had any considerable Estate, I ought to bequeath the greatest Part of it to Him. It has bin thot, that I have Bags by me, which is a great Mistake: I have not Twenty Pounds in Silver or in Bills. But whatever I have (be it more or less) whether in Silver or Bills, I give it to Him my Eldest Son. Item, I give to Him my Pendulum Watch, Item my Pendulum Clock, Item my Silver Tankard: And I bequeath to Him all my Manuscripts, and the one half of my Library, desiring that my Books or Manuscripts may not be sold or embezled.

Concerning my Son Samuel Mather, I have expended more in his Education, than on any one of my Children. I gave Him a considerable Number of Books at his going for England. And a Considerable Part of his Uncle Nathanael's Library has fallen to his Share. He liveth where He may furnish himself with Variety of Books; and is blest with an Estate able to do it. Nevertheless, considering that He has bin a dutiful Son, and an Honor to his Father's Name, I bequeath to Him a fourth Part of my Library, in Testimony of my paternal Affection.

The remaining fourth Part I bequeath to my Fatherless Grandson Mather Byles, in Case He shall be educated for, and employed in, the Work of the Ministry; (which I much desire & pray for) leaving it with my Executor to order & determine what particuler Books shall be his; only I give Him (in Case aforesaid) particularly Poli Synopsis Criticorum in five Volumes in Folio, and his English Annotations, with the Continuation, in Two Folios.

I give to my Grandson Samuel Mather Piscatoris Commentaria in Biblia in three Folios.

I give to my Grandson Thomas Walter the English Annotations in Two Folios, also the Dutch Annotations in two Folios.

The Remainder of my Estate in Housing or Moveables, I give to be equally divided among my Beloved Daughters Maria, Elizabeth, Sarah & Abigail. What I give to my Daughter Elizabeth, I desire it may (if his Mother can) be improv'd towards the Education of her only Son, (my Grandson Mather Byles) in Learning, because he is a Child whom God has blessed with a strong Memory, ready Capacity & Aptness to learn. I leave it as my dying Request to his Uncle my Son Cotton Mather to take Care of the Education of that Child as of his own. If He shall obtain Subscriptions for his Education for the Ministry (as He knows I have done for more Fatherless Children than one) I am persuaded his own Children will not fare the worse for his being a Father to a Fatherless Child. To prevent his being chargeable as much as I can, I give Him my wearing Apparel; excepting my Chamblet Cloak, which I give to my Executor.

If the LORD shall take away Mather Byles by Death before He is of full Age, or if He shall not be employed in the Work of the Ministry, it is my Mind and Will that then the Books bequeathed to Him shall be given to such other of my Grandchildren as shall be Preachers of the Gospel of CHRIST, according as my Executor shall dispose.

I dy beleiving that GOD will bless my Children after I am taken from them; and my Persuasion is grounded on these as well as other Scriptures. Gen. xxv. ii. & xviii. 21. Psalm xxxvii. 25. Prov. xx. 7. Unto GOD in JESUS CHRIST I commit myself & all mine forever.

Finally I constitute and appoint my Beloved Son Cotton Mather to be the Sole Executor of this my Will: entreating my Worthy Friends Mr Thomas Hutchinson, Mr Adam Winthrop, Mr Edward Hutchinson, Mr John Ruck & Mr John Frizell to be assistants as Overseers; praying them that, for my Sake, but especially for the sake of the Glory which I hope may come to GOD thereby, they will be Kind to my Fatherless Grandson Mather Byles.

This I declare to be my last Will & Testament: And I have accordingly written this with my own Hand, and herennto affixed my Seal, The Seventh Day of the fourth Month. called June, in the Year of our LORD One Thousand, Seven hundred and Eighteen.

Witnesses that I declared this
to be my Will:

INCREASE MATHER. [SEAL.]

(Signed, and sealed with wax.)

JONAS CLARKE.
EDWARD WILDER.
JOSEPH WOODWELL.

I do hereby signify to my Executor, That it is my Mind & Will that my Negro Servant called Spaniard Shall not be sold after my Decease; but I do then give Him his Liberty: Let him then be esteemed a Free Negro.

Jun. 4, 1719.

Since the above was furnished by Dr. Shurtleff, as mentioned in the note referring to this Appendix, a copy of the will has been taken by another hand, and published in the "Genealogical Register" for October, 1851.

I introduce here a table of the Mather and Cotton Lineage, prepared by J. W. Thornton, Esq.; and also the Rev. Increase Mather's Family Record, from his Family Bible, now in possession of one of his descendants, Miss Elizabeth Anna Byles, of Burlington, N.J.: —

of Rev. Jas. Hor-
rocks, of Lanca-
shire.
 Lincolnshire, Dec. 4, 1585; B.D. at Cambridge; Dean of
 Emmanuel College; minister of Boston in Lincolnshire,
 a widow of Boston in N. E. 19 years. Died Dec. 22, 1652,
 20 years; at Dorchester, Aug. 23, 1636. Died April 29, 1669,
 1624.

Rev. Mr. SEABORNE COT-
TON, b. 12 (6), 1633; Har-
College, 1651; minister of
Wethersfield, Ct., 1655;
ord. at Hampton, N. H.,
1660; died April 20, 1686.

Rev. Mr. JOHN COTTON, =
b. May 8, 1658; Har. Col.,
1678; ord. at Hampton,
N. H., Nov. 19, 1696; d.
March 27, 1710.

DOROTHY COTTON, b. July 10, 1693; d. May 20, 1748; m. Dec. 21, 1710, Rev. Mr. NATHANIEL GOOKIN, of Hampton, N. H. Their gr.

son, Hon. Daniel Cookin,
a capt. in the Revolutionary
Army; one of the "Cin-
cinnati;" Judge of Ct. of
Com. Pleas and of Probate
for Rockingham co., &c.
His dau Elizabeth mar.
James Brown Thornton,
of Saco, merchant, Jan.
20, 1817.

a niece of Gov. Belcher
1st wife.

a dau. of Lieut. Gov. Taintor
2d wife.

Rev. William Walter,
D.D., Har. Col. Rector
of Trin. Ch., Boston;
died 1800, aged 63. 17

<i>Anne</i> , dau. of Capt. T. Tros-		21	
Lakes, an eminent merch.			
of Boston; born Oct. 12,	MATHER, D.D.,		
1663; niece of Sir Edward	Presidl. of Har-		
and Lark, M.D.; and	vard Coll.; b.		
gr. dan. of Hon. Stephen			
Goodyear, Deputy Gov. of			
New Haven Colony. She			
died at Brookline, March			
29, 1737, aged 74. She	June 21, 1639;		
survived Dr. Mather, her	died Aug. 23,		
second husband.			
			1733.

MARIA COTTON, b. 1641; ^{1st} died April 4, 1714. First wife, and mother of Dr. Mather's children.

Maria,^{1st} Greene, Eliza = Josiah
 Beth. Pyles.
 24
 = Ffield.

er, = Rev. *Mather Pyles*, b. March
 26, 1706; Har. Coll., 1735.
 His son, *Mather Pyles*, D.D.,
 was of N. London, Ct.; and
 of Christ Church, Boston.

Rev. The
b. Dec. 7

— Nathaniel Mather Crocker, who dedicated to Har-

Mather, — Rev. Eleazer Mather, = dan., of John
of Northampton, b. i Warham,
1637, d. 1699.

[}
[}

Sammel, — Hannah, dan.
Mather, of Gov. Treat,
Windsor, d. of Conn.; died
March 18th, March 8, 1708;
17-28, Harv. at. 47.
Colt., 167.

=
John Williams, = "The
Redeem'd Cap-
tive."

v. *Nehemiah*
v. *Balter*,
Roxbury,
league of
the *Apostle*
p. 17; died
Nov. 17, 1750,
aged 86.

Rev. SAMUEL MATHER, D.D., Har. Col., 1723; ord. colleague of Rev. Josh. Grev. June 21, 1732; d. June 27, 1785, aged 79. Buried in the fam. tomb at Copp's Hill.

Journal.—Joseph, son of Rev. Josiah Crocker, of Taunton.

Rev. Saml. Mather,
of Dublin, b. May
13, 1626; Mar. Col.,
1633; d. Oct. 29,
1671.

(1) 24 WID. ELIZABETH = WID. GEORGE,
MATH- F.R.S.; b. Hubbard, dau. of
25 Dr. John Clark, Samuel Lee.
; colleague August 18, 1703; She survived
Mather, May she died Nov. 18, Cot. Mather,
d. Feb. 15, 1713. She had by Dr. Mather six
; children. b. 1703.

dau. of Col. Thomas
 Hutchinson, and sister of
 Gov. Thomas, the His-
 torian of Massachusetts.

on. Increase; Samuel, of Margaret, dau.
Boston; d. of Benja. Ger-
1813, aged 76. ish, d. Feb. 25,
sea. 1812, aged 94.

CRESCENTIUS MATHER.

I was married y^e 6 day of y^e 1st month being y^e fifth day of y^e week 166 $\frac{1}{2}$.

My son *Cotton* was born at Boston N. E. y^e 12 day of y^e 12 month a quarter of an hour past 10 before noon being y^e fifth day of y^e week 166 $\frac{2}{3}$. He was baptised at y^e old church in Boston by Mr. Wilson 15 day of y^e same month 166 $\frac{2}{3}$.

My daughter *Maria* was born at Boston $\frac{1}{17}$ of March about midnight 166 $\frac{4}{5}$ ^{Wednesday} _{Thursday} baptised by me 19 of the same month.

My daughter Elizabeth was born January 6 about four O'Clock P.M. Lords day 1666. Baptised by Mr. Wilson at the old church in Boston Feb. 3. 166 $\frac{6}{7}$, married to Mr. Greenough July 1696. Married to Mr. Josias Byles Oct. 6. 1703, died Aug. $\frac{1}{20}$ 1745. Her only child Mather was born March 15, 1707.

My son *Nathaniel* was born at Boston, N. Eng. July 6 a little before 2 O'clock in y^e morning being Tuesday 1669. Baptised by me 11th of the same month 1669, died Oct. 17. 1688. I was then in England.

These four children were all born in our house, viz. that which was my father Cotton's, wherein I dwelt 8 years and wherein y^r mother was born.

My daughter *Sarah* was born in November 9th about midnight Wednesday 1671, baptised by me the 12 day of the same month 1671.

My son *Samuel* was born Aug. 28. Friday about 3 quarters of an hour after four in y^e morning, baptised by me y^e 30 day of y^e same month 1674.

These two were born in y^e house which was bought of Mr. Arthur Chickley.

My daughter *Abigail* was born 13th of April, Friday $\frac{3}{4}$ of an hour after 3 P.M. 1677, baptised by me y^e 20 day of y^e same month Friday at Deacon Philips house where was a prayer meeting that day 1677. (born in y^e house which was Captain Bredons.

My daughter *Hannah* was born May 30 Lords day morning between 1 & 2. 1680. Baptised by me July 16 Friday, in my own house, the reason why she was baptised no sooner & not in y^e publick meeting house was because of my long sickness and weakness, August 1680. Died Dec^r 2 about 4. A.M. 1706.

My daughter *Catherine* was born Sept^r. 14 Tuesday 3 P.M. 1682. Baptised by me Sept^r. 17, 1682. Died June 11. 1683 about 11 A.M.

My daughter *Jerusha* was born April $\frac{1}{17}$ ^{Wednesday} _{Thursday} half an hour past 7 P.M. 1684. Baptised by me April 20. 1684. Died Dec^r. 20 about 12 A. M.

1710. Her daughter Jerusha Oliver was born Saturday 17 day of December & baptized by me 31 of the same month, the day after her pious mother died. The child died Jan^y. 4. 5 O'clock P.M. These three children were born in the house which was built for me.

I am indebted for the above to the politeness of S. G. Drake, Esq.

E. — PAGE 114.

Cotton Mather was a most voluminous writer. His printed works amounted to three hundred and eighty-two. Many of these are occasional sermons and pamphlets on subjects of public interest. Among the most important, besides those of which I have spoken, are his "Christian Philosopher," a work on Natural Theology, and the "Magnalia Christi Americana, or the Ecclesiastical History of New England," first published in London, in 1702, in a large folio volume. The last-named book has been differently estimated by persons of different tastes. Some have admired and highly praised it; others ridiculed its style, and complained of its inaccuracies. Grahame calls it the most interesting work which the literature of this country has produced, and considers some of its biographical sketches equal or superior to Plutarch. Quite as strong expressions of commendation might be quoted from eminent men of the past century; although some of the author's contemporaries, whose prejudices he offended, were bitter in their invectives. Cotton Mather himself says he does not wonder that there were some who disliked and abused the "Magnalia," because it was written to serve the interests of real, solid, vital piety, rather than a formal religion; and because, showing the virtues of the Nonconformists, it of course set in a strong light the persecuting spirit from which they suffered.

Cotton Mather has satirically noticed one class of those who attacked the "Magnalia," in a reply to the strictures of "one John Oldmixon, in a book entitled, 'The English Empire in America.'" There is a good deal of point in such remarks as the following: —

“The accuser would have it believed, that the Church History is very trivial in the matter of it. Yes, by all means! The marvellous works of God in producing and maintaining and afflicting and relieving of colonies in a matchless manner, formed upon the noble intentions of pure and undefiled religion; the wise measures taken by the best of men to establish that religion, and the bright patterns of living up to it, seen in the lives of such men; and as choice materials as a Church History can be composed of,—these are trivial matters! Come, then, let us go to Master Oldmixon for important matters. It is a trouble unto me to descend unto any thing so ludicrous; but it is he, and not I, that must answer for it. In his history, wherein he rails at ours, you shall find whole pages consecrated unto long, long, tiresome relations of some that he singles out as the more curious events: he calls ‘em so. These curious events are, ‘that a couple of starved Indians (at Hudson’s Bay) went a-fishing,—and then a-hunting,—and met with only two moose,—and how ‘twas,—and how, the geese flying away to the southward in October, the people there [such their segacity!] knew that hard weather was approaching;—and in November [oh, marvellous!] it snowed. And then,—a long, tedious narrative, how they catched partridges, [not woodcocks!] yea [an exploit that should be told unto future generations], four men, in a week’s time killed six and twenty. And then [a terrible thing happened, as much to be remembred as the Sicilian earthquakes] in December, a boy had his feet hurt with the frost.’ And an hundred more such curious events is this history set off withal. These, it seems, are the important matters, that are most worthy of a room in history. A Church History, furnished as aforesaid, has only trivial matters for you!”

That Cotton Mather knew more of the history of this country than any man of his age, is the testimony of all competent judges. He has thrown into the “Magnalia” a large mass of materials for a history, many of which are valuable and interesting to the general reader, and indispensable to any future historian of New England. That there are inaccuracies and partial statements in the book is not a matter of surprise. It is very difficult to find any writer concerning the men and movements of his own age who is wholly free from prejudice, or any voluminous history that is entirely accurate. This is no place, however, for a criticism of the book; instead of which, I will let Cotton Mather speak for himself. If his views and practice with regard to style are not agreeable to any reader, perhaps his remarks on the subject may tend to put his critics in good humor.

“There has been a deal of a do about a style; so much that I must offer you my sentiments upon it. There is a way of writing wherein the author endeavours that the reader may have something to the purpose in every paragraph. There is not only a vigour sensible in every sentence, but the paragraph is embellished with profitable references, even to something beyond what is directly spoken. Formal and painful quotations are not studied; yet all that could be learnt from them is insinuated. The writer pretends not unto reading, yet he could not have writ as he does if he had not read very much in his time; and his composures are not only a cloth of gold, but also stuck with as many jewels as the gown of a Russian ambassador. This way of writing has been decried by many, and is at this day more than ever so, for the same reason that, in the old story, the grapes were decried,—that they were not ripe. A lazy, ignorant, conceited sett of authors would perswade the whole tribe to lay aside that way of writing, for the same reason that one would have perswaded his brethren to part with the encumbrance of their bushy tails. But, however fashion and humour may prevail, they must not think that the club at their coffee-house is all the world; but there will always be those who will in this case be governed by indisputable reason, and who will think that the real excellency of a book will never ly in saying of little, that the less one has for his money in a book 'tis really the more valuable for it, and that the less one is instructed in a book, and the more of superfluous margin and superficial harangue, and the less of substantial matter, one has in it, the more 'tis to be accounted of; and if a more massy way of writing be never so much disgusted at this day, a better gust will come on, as will some other things, *qua jam cecidere*. In the mean time, nothing appears to me more impertinent and ridiculous than the modern way [I cannot say rule, for they have none!] of criticising. The blades that set up for criticks,—I know not who constituted or commissioned 'em!—they appear to me, for the most part, as contemptible as they are a supercilious generation: for, indeed, no two of them have the same style; and they are as intollerably cross-grained and severe in their censures upon one another as they are upon the rest of mankind. But while each of them, conceitedly enough, sets up for the standard of perfection, we are entirely at a loss which fire to follow. Nor can you easily find any one thing wherein they agree for their style, except perhaps a perpetual care to give us jejune and empty pages, without such touches of erudition (to speak in the style of an ingenious traveller) as may make the discourses less tedious, and more enriching to the mind of him that peruses them. There is much talk of a florid style obtaining among the pens that are most in vogue; but how often would it puzzle one, even with the best glasses, to find the flowres! And if they were to be chastized for it, it would be with much-what as much of justice as Jerom was for being a Ciceronian. After all, every man will have his own style, which will distinguish him as much

as his gate; and if you can attain to that which I have newly described, but always writing so as to give an easy conveyance unto your ideas, I would not have you by any scourging be driven out of your gate, but if you must confess a fault in it, make a confession like that of the lad unto his father, while he was beating him for his versifying.

“However, since every man will have his own style, I would pray that we may learn to treat one another with mutual civilities and condescensions, and handsomely indulge one another in this, as gentlemen do in other matters.

“I wonder what ails people, that they can’t let Cicero write in the style of Cicero, and Seneca write in the (much other!) style of Seneca; and own that both may please in their several ways.”

In another place, speaking of his own writings, he uses this language: —

“I am no pretender to what some have been commended for, — *the art of good narrative*. I acknowledge that I am too liable to an infirmity of *salting* my sentences, now and then, with short, instructive, and unforced intermixtures of something or other that I have read of. But, as I was upon reforming it, I stumbled upon a passage in a letter of Mons. Tournefort unto the Lord Pontchartrain: ‘You gave me leave to insert some touches of erudition to heighten the subject treated of; and I fancy such additions will make them the less tiresome.’ This a little emboldened me.”

Again, he says, in relation to one of his works: —

“I can truly say *I have studiously laid aside that care of embellishing. I have drop’t a world of what some would count ornaments*, which, while I was writing, offered themselves to my mind.”

E. — PAGE 130.

FORM OF UNION BETWEEN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST, LATE UNDER THE PASTORAL CARE OF THE REV. DR. PEMBERTON, AND THE SECOND CHURCH OF CHRIST IN BOSTON, UNDER THE PASTORAL CARE OF THE REV. JOHN LATHROP.

First, the Moderator of the New Brick Church, late under the pastoral care of the Rev. Dr. Pemberton, addresses himself as follows to the members of the church: —

“Brethren, — It having pleased Almighty God to remove from us, by death, our late evangelical pastor, the Rev. Dr. Pemberton, under whose ministry some of us have sat with pleasure for many years, and the great

Head of the Church having so ordered events in the kingdom of providence, that we have enjoyed the ministerial labors of the Rev. John Lathrop, who has statedly ministered to us, and to the church under his particular care, which has assembled with us since the evacuation of the town by the British forces in March, 1776;—finding ourselves reduced to a small number, it has been thought that it might tend to the glory of the Redeemer's kingdom, and to our own edification, for us to unite and incorporate with the Second Church of Christ, under the pastoral care of the Rev. John Lathrop, with whose ministerial labors we have expressed our full satisfaction; that from henceforth we be one church or corporate body, equally entitled to all the rights and privileges, all the stock, whether in plate, money, books, houses, lands, and hereditaments, which have hitherto been the separate property of each church.

“As this important affair has been for some time under consideration, and every member of the church has had time to think and determine, if you please, I will put the question. If it be your minds, then, my brethren, that the Church of Christ, late under the care of the Rev. Dr. Pemberton, should unite and incorporate with the Second Church of Christ in Boston, please to signify it by the usual sign of holding up the hand.”

The Moderator will then address himself to the brethren of the congregation usually known by the name of the New Brick:—

“Brethren,—As the Church of Christ, late under the pastoral care of the Rev. Dr. Pemberton, have now voted to unite and incorporate with the Second Church of Christ in this town, under the pastoral care of the Rev. Mr. Lathrop, it is proper that the congregation who usually attended on the ministry of the late Dr. Pemberton should signify their concurrence with what the church has done. If it be your minds, then, brethren, to concur with the church in their act of union and incorporation with the Second Church of Christ in this town, under the pastoral care of the Rev. John Lathrop, please to signify it.”

The Moderator of the Second Church of Christ in this town will address himself to that church in the following manner:—

“Brethren of the Second Church in this town,—You have now attended to the vote of the Church of Christ, late under the pastoral care of the Rev. Dr. Pemberton, for uniting and incorporating with us. It is now for us to declare our concurrence with what is expressed in the vote of union just now passed by this our sister church. If you please, I will put the question. If it be your minds, then, my brethren, that the Church of Christ, late under the pastoral care of the Rev. Dr. Pemberton, should be united with us, so that from this time we be one church or corporate body, known by the Second Church of Christ in Boston; and that all those rights and privileges, all the stock in plate, money, books, houses, lands, and hereditaments, which have hitherto been the separate property of each church, shall from this time become one common stock, to which all

the members of this united church shall be equally entitled; and from this time we consider the members of the church late under the care of the Rev. Dr. Pemberton, and the members of our own church, as one body, equally bound to watch over one another in love, and promote the edification and happiness of the whole,—if this be your minds, please to signify it.”

The Moderator will then address himself to the brethren of the congregation usually known by the name of the Old North:—

“Brethren,—You have attended to the union which has now taken place. The church late under the pastoral care of the Rev. Dr. Pemberton, and the Second Church of Christ in this town, are no more twain, but one body in the Lord. You have also attended to the vote of the New Brick congregation, declaring their concurrence with the church in the act of union which has been passed. Nothing now remains but your concurrence with the whole. If it be your minds, then, that, inasmuch as a union has been complicated between the churches, the congregations should be united likewise, please to manifest it.

Conclusion. “Brethren,—As we are now one church and one congregation, God grant we may be one in Christ; equally interested in the merits of his obedience and death. God grant we may be edified more and more in love, and that by his grace we may all prepared to join with the general assembly and church of the first-born on high, to ascribe blessing and honor and glory and power unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and to the Lamb, for ever and ever. Amen and Amen.”

Boston, June 30, 1779.

The above was drawn up by Deacon Tudor.

The following is a copy of my letter of resignation referred to in the concluding part of the history of the Second Church.

TO THE PROPRIETORS OF THE SECOND CHURCH.

My Friends,—After long and prayerful deliberation, attended with no little suffering, I have become convinced that it is my duty to make to you the communication which I now send. Some of you may have anticipated it; to a few it may be unexpected; but to all I trust it will approve itself as being neither unreasonable, unfriendly, nor unjust. I ask for it attentive and calm consideration, and kind construction.

From the hour when a small majority of the proprietors of the Second Church voted to build a new house of worship on the spot occupied by the old, dissensions and embarrassments have afflicted our society, which, be-

fore that period, had been proverbially harmonious and prosperous. You are aware, that my own advice was against the course taken by the majority, as well as against building a costly church. In evidence of my views on these subjects, I refer you to a letter addressed by me to the society, when the question of rebuilding was first agitated. You will find the letter on file amongst the papers in the keeping of your clerk. Permit me, however, to quote from it a few sentences. [These may be found on p. 148.]

Such were my opinions and feelings; such the counsels which I presumed to offer. I had no right to expect for them so much influence as to overbalance the wishes of the majority of the proprietors. But I think experience has clearly proved that they were wise and seasonable; and that, if they had been regarded, both the parish and its minister would have been saved from much trouble.

When, however, the vote had been passed by the society to build upon the old spot, it became my duty not only to acquiesce, but to use my best exertions to produce a general feeling of interest and good-will throughout the congregation. You will bear me witness that I was not faithless in these respects, but that whatever influence I could command was in favor of union and peace, and in furtherance of the plans of the majority of the proprietors.

For a short time after the completion of your new edifice, there were signs of a renewal of our prosperity. Former proprietors repurchased, old worshippers returned, new members were added to the society, and all things went on well. But, when the magnitude of your debt was fully realized, it not only added a *new* cause of discontent and discord to those which were beginning to subside, but revived and strengthened all the rest.

Various plans have been tried by you to lessen your debt; but they have failed. I have myself three times preached to the society on the subject, once addressed you at a proprietors' meeting, and once gone about soliciting individual contributions,—obtaining nearly enough to secure the safety of your building; but no positive or permanent benefit has resulted from my efforts. If the last of them had been seconded with a little more spirit, it would have succeeded, and your troubles would have been by this time at an end. I must be permitted to express my profound grief and surprise, that, when the work of saving the church was so nearly accomplished, it should have been suffered to fall through.

At length, in consequence of an act of the Standing Committee, nearly one hundred proprietors gave up their pews. Some of them continue to worship with us; but many have withdrawn,—disappointed, weary, desponding, or perhaps offended,—till but a small remnant is left of the congregation once familiar and dear to me. The departure of friend after friend from your pews has caused me pang after pang, till my heart has become sore from the rupture of so many cherished pastoral ties. Nor is

the pain of separation lightened to me by the tokens I have uniformly received of the unchanged attachment of those who have left.

Such is the present condition of the society, and such, in brief, the history of the circumstances which have produced it. And, now, what is the prospect before us? Let it be looked at clearly and soberly. Your debt of forty thousand dollars remains unpaid. No provision is made, none now proposed, for paying it. The pews cannot be sold, — no man would be so imprudent as to buy, none so unwise as to expect to sell. The interest on the debt, together with the current expenses of the society, can only be raised by very high taxes, and the rent of a large number of pews. I believe it is well ascertained, that the amount you will thus procure during the present year will fall so far short of the requisite sum as considerably to augment your debt. Your pecuniary embarrassment is becoming greater every day. I can see nothing before you but deeper difficulty, the gradual and steady desertion of worshippers, and the sacrifice of your house. Not one ray of promise sufficient to excite the hope of a judicious mind, so far as I can see, breaks the impending gloom. All that any of you say to encourage me is, that “*something* MAY yet turn up.” But, my friends, the caprice of chance is no basis for the plans of reasonable and serious men; and, even if it were *ordinarily* safe to rely upon it, it would be, in the present instance, too much to expect such a rare revolution of Fortune’s wheel as would discharge your enormous debt, which, in spite of all our efforts, under more favorable circumstances than can again occur, has not been even so much as diminished.

Meanwhile, the *religious* condition of the society is wholly discouraging, and its *benevolent action* entirely crippled. This is the consideration that weighs more heavily upon my heart than all others. If it were not for this fact, all your troubles might be remedied. If there were but religious life in the society, even its immense pecuniary burden would be comparatively light. But I have long mourned that it is dying out. I have long felt that circumstances must render my preaching abortive. I have nothing to hope for in occupying your pulpit, except to defer a little longer the sale of the house. Hard and sad experience has taught me, that I cannot look for much spiritual edification against the pressure of our temporal distress. I have nothing to cheer me, — every thing to dishearten. I can enjoy no satisfactory Christian communion with you, whilst secular difficulties take precedence of all other subjects of conversation and interest, and seem to swallow up the hearts of my people. I fear for my own spiritual life. Soul and body are beginning to suffer from long anxiety, discouragement, and suspense.

Influenced by such considerations, I am constrained to ask to be released from my obligations to the proprietors of the Second Church, and do herewith tender to you my resignation of them. From the *congregation* and the *church* — all whose members since my connection with them I have

sincerely loved—I can never be spiritually separated. My heart is true to them still, wherever they or I may dwell. If this instrument were to dis sever the ties that bind me to them, my hand could not have written it. But many of them have already left your pews; and the remainder might soon follow, even if I were to retain your pulpit. It is to the small body of less than a score of *proprietors of the building*, that, according to legal usage, I offer my resignation. Individually, they are included with those of whom I have just now spoken. But collectively, in their capacity of owners of the house, I do not feel as if they constituted the society which has been, and ever will be, dear to me. The *house* has scattered the flock,—the *house* is breaking up the church. It is from the house I desire to be separated, before it shall consummate the destruction of a venerable and once lovely and most beloved Christian association.

In conclusion, I must express the feeling of deep reluctance under which I have prepared, and now send, this communication. No one of you can understand how deep and tender has been my affection for the Second Church, nor how painful is the conviction, that, without the occurrence of any thing to disturb that affection, and without the forfeiture of the love of any of the members of the congregation, a mere pecuniary difficulty should compel me to resign my pastoral office. Throughout all the troubles of the society, I rejoice to feel that I have experienced from every parishioner unvarying kindness and respect; and I am pleased to say that I have received from the proprietors the prompt and full payment of my salary. No minister can have found a flock more friendly and considerate towards himself.

And now I cannot close without saying, that I had formed, and have fulfilled, the purpose to remain with you, and to share your burden, so long as there might be any prospect of sustaining the *society* by saving your *house*. As far as I can see or can learn from your treasurer, the case is as hopeless as I have described it to be. If, however, any thing can yet be done towards liquidating your debt, no consideration shall avail to induce me to separate myself from you at the present time. On the contrary, no one would be willing to sacrifice more than I should be to hold the house of worship in your possession, and thereby to keep alive the church and congregation.

Faithfully, your friend and servant,

CHANDLER ROBBINS.

Boston, June 21, 1848.

Several matters of historical interest, not particularly referred to in the History of the Second Church, are here introduced. For the following copy of names and its tabular arrangement, I am indebted to the skill and kindness of Mr. Thos. B. Wyman, jun.

ADMISSIONS AND BAPTISMS

AT

THE SECOND CHURCH.

N.B. — This table has been arranged alphabetically, for the sake of convenience. The *admissions* are placed first under each family name; the *baptisms* follow, being divided from the former by a dash. Where the Christian name of the parent is not given, it has been omitted in the Church Records.

ABBOT.					
1706	Sept. 15.	Rebeckah.	William, of John,	Jan. 1, 1726	7
1727	Nov. 12.	Elizabeth.	Susanna, of „	Aug. 3, 1729.	
1727	Dec. 24.	Moses.	Margaret, of „	Apr. 22, 1733.	
			Ammi, of John and		
			Mary,	Aug. 16, 1730.	
Hull, of Rebeckah,	June 21, 1702.		Benjamin, of „	Jan. 12, 1734	5
Moses, of	April 2, 1704.		Isaac, of Mary,	Feb. 18, 1732	3
Elizabeth, of Moses,	Mar. 16, 1707.		Joseph, of „	Feb. 10, 1733	4
Richard, of	Feb. 20, 1708	9	George, of „	Aug. 28, 1737.	
Moses, of Rebecka,	Aug. 5, 1711.		Elizabeth, „	Oct. 28, 1739.	
Rebeckah, of	Sept. 6, 1713.		Rebeckah, of Temp'ee,	Aug. 24, 1718.	
Richard, of	May 29, 1715.		John, of Dorcas,	Jan. 9, 1736	7
Ebenezer, of	July 7, 1717.		John, of „	Nov. 12, 1738.	
ADAMS.			Dorcas, of „	Nov. 2, 1740.	
1658	Jan. 16.	Nathaniel.	Jonathan, of	Jan. 3, 1696	7
1677	Mar. 9.	S.	Priscilla, of	May 2, 1703.	
1693	Sept. 24.	Rebeckah.	Mary, of	July 11, 1708.	
1698	Dec. 11.	Priscilla.	John, of	Oct. 15, 1710.	
1714	May 9.	Mary.	Sarah, of	Sept. 14, 1712.	
1714	Aug. 1.	John.	Mary, of	Sept. 21, 1712.	
1724	May 3.	John.	Thomas, of	Sept. 20, 1713.	
1782	June 16.	Mary.	Silence, of	Jan. 30, 1714	5
			ALCOCK.		
Joseph, of Martha,	Nov. 17, 1695.		1676	Apr. 30.	Samuel.
Elizabeth, of „	Oct. 17, 1697.				
Jacob, of „	Sept. 3, 1699.		Elizabeth, of M.,	Feb. 8, 1712	3
John, of Elizabeth,	Apr. 11, 1697.		Rebeckah, of „	Feb. 8, 1712	3
Joseph, of „	Sept. 24, 1699.		John, of „	Feb. 8, 1712	3
Nathaniel, „	Mar. 8, 1702.		Patience, of „	Feb. 8, 1712	3
Joseph, of „	Dec. 10, 1704.		Mary, of Milom,	Jan. 2, 1714	5
David, of „	May 30, 1708.		ALEXANDER.		
Abigail, of T.,	Apr. 17, 1698.		Edward, of	June 22, 1712.	
(of Charlestown.)			Lydia, of Lydia,	Nov. 8, 1713.	
Nathaniel, of Lois,	Nov. 9, 1701.		ALLEN.		
Abigail, of Dinah,	Apr. 25, 1703.		1727	Jan. 14.	Mary.
Hannah, of Hannah,	Sept. 14, 1707.				
Eliza, of „	Sept. 14, 1707.		Mary, of Mary,	Oct. 31, 1725.	
John, of John,	Dec. 4, 1715.		Martha, of „	Nov. 20, 1726.	
Mary, of „	Jan. 12, 1717	8	William, of „	Dec. 7, 1729.	
Joseph, of „	June 5, 1720.		Elizabeth, „	Apr. 9, 1732.	
Mary, of „	Aug. 19, 1722.		Ann, of „	July 13, 1735.	
Sarah, of „	July 26, 1724.				
Benjamin, „	Aug. 15, 1725.				

William, of Mary, June 4, 1738.
 Thomas, of Aug. 7, 1720.
 Ebenezer, of Aug. 28, 1720.
 Mary, of Dec. 31, 1721.
 Sarah, of Aug. 18, 1723.

ALLEY.

Jacob, of Priscilla, June 6, 1708.

AMBROSE.

Elizabeth, of Eliz., Dec. 18, 1698.
 Lydia, of Mar. 2, 1701.

AMOS.

1666 Apr. 29. Hugh.
 1666 Apr. 29. S.

AND(ER)SON.

1672 Sept. 7. John.
 1672 Oct. 20. Mary.
 1716 July 8. Mary.

ANGIER.

1723 June 9. Sarah.
 John, of Eliza, Jan. 23, 1714[5]

APPLETON.

1743 Sarah.

ARCHBALD.

1776 Nov. 10. Anna.

ARCHER.

1711[2 Jan. 6. Thomas.

ARMSTRONG.

1670 S.
 Mary, of Margaret, May 24, 1696.
 Matthew, of „ Apr. 24, 1698.
 Thomas, of „ July 21, 1700.
 Hannah, of „ May 5, 1706.

ARNOLD.

Thomas, of May 16, 1697.
 Mary, of Apr. 21, 1700.
 Elizabeth, of Mar. 18, 1705.

ARTHUR.

Joseph, of Aug. 21, 1715.

ASHLEY.

1691 July to Sept. Mary.

ASHWOOD, or ASTWOOD.

1650 June 5. James.

ATKINS, or ADKINS.

1673 Dec. 6. B.
 1673 Dec. 6. S.
 1677 July 29. S.
 1791 Hannah.

Ruth, of Mar. 22, 1702.
 Thomas, of June 7, 1702.
 Elizabeth, of July 23, 1704.
 Richard, of Oct. 20, 1706.
 Timothy, of Dec. 23, 1711.
 Ruth, of Sept. 8, 1717.
 John, of July 17, 1720.

ATKINSON.

William, of Eliza, Mar. 26, 1727.

ATWOOD.

1675[6 Feb. 20. John.
 1695[6 Jan. 26. Mary.

Mary, of John, Sept. 6, 1691.
 John, of J. Feb. 18, 1693[1
 Samuel, of John and
 Mary, Mar. 29, 1696.
 Ann, of John, June 20, 1697.
 Elizabeth, „ Aug. 21, 1698.
 Abigail, „ Nov. 19, 1699.
 Joshua, of „ Apr. 13, 1701.
 Zachariah, of Dec. 27, 1719.

AUSTILL.

1724 Nov. 2. Joanna.

Joseph, of Nov. 6, 1726.

AUSTIN.

1773 Oct. Samuel.

AVIS.

1703[4 Jan. 23. Samuel.
 1703[4 Jan. 23. Mary.

Samuel, of Samuel, Apr. 18, 1697.
 Mary, of „ Dec. 4, 1698.
 John, of „ Oct. 20, 1700.
 Samuel, of „ Feb. 6, 1703[1
 William, of „ Mar. 25, 1705.
 Mary, of „ May 5, 1706.
 Samuel, of „ Nov. 2, 1707.
 William, of „ May 22, 1709.
 Isaac, of „ Sept. 14, 1712.
 Mehetabel, of „ Dec. 9, 1716.

AYRES.

1710 Nov. 5. John.
 1718 Apr. 6. Nathaniel.

Mary, of Eliza, Oct. 12, 1707.
 John, of Nathaniel, Mar. 14, 1725.

Joseph, of Nathaniel, Jan. 29, 1726[7
Margaret, of „ June 22, 1729.
Nathaniel, of Nathaniel and Eliza, Sept. 1, 1734.

BABBAGE.

Bathsheba, of Eliz., July 22, 1694.
Sarah, of „ Oct. 20, 1695.
James, of „ Mar. 13, 1698.
Joseph, of Eliz., June 11, 1699.
Mary, of „ June 11, 1699.
Benjamin, „ Dec. 8, 1700.

BACHILER.

Susannah, of „ July 18, 1703.

BACON.

1660 July 8. Daniel.
1660 July 8. S.

Mary, of Josiah, Sept. 30, 1722.
Josiah, of „ Mar. 1, 1724.
Joseph, of „ Oct. 31, 1725.
John, of „ Apr. 16, 1727.
Joseph, of „ Jan. 28, 1727[8

BADCOCK.

William, of „ Feb. 15, 1707[8
Elizabeth, of „ Dec. 17, 1710.
Enoch, of „ Sept. 14, 1712.

BADGER.

Bethiah, of Benj., Jan. 12, 1734[5
Rebeckah, of „ May 1, 1737.
John, of „ Oct. 29, 1738.
Mercy, of „ Oct. 29, 1738.
Abigail, of „ June 14, 1741.

BAILEY, or BAYLEY.

1685 Dec. 27. Samuel.
1726 Dec. 12. Samuel.

Benjamin, of Israel, June 13, 1714.
Loyd, of Isaac, Oct. 28, 1716.
Martha, of Israel, Dec. 29, 1719.
Hannah, of „ Nov. 16, 1718.

BAITH.

Mary, of Seith, Mar. 2, 1740.

BAKER.

1655 Nov. 9, to
June 3, 1657. S.
1665 July 2. Thankful.
1678 Apr. 14. Thomas.
1700 May 26. John.
1702 Feb. 21. Mary.

Joseph, of Thomas, Jan. 25, 1690[1

Benjamin, of Thos., Apr. 21, 1695.
Nathaniel, of „ Feb. 21, 1696[7
Mary, of „ Feb. 22, 1707[8
Thomas, of „ Feb. 20, 1708[9
Joseph, of „ Mar. 9, 1712.
Sarah, of „ Feb. 17, 1716[7
John, of „ Mar. 30, 1718.
Sarah, of John, Apr. 4, 1703.
Thomas, of „ May 27, 1705.
John, of „ Feb. 16, 1706[7
of „ Dec. 19, 1708.

Mary, of John and
Mary, Dec. 10, 1710.
Elizabeth, of John, Mar. 9, 1712.
Joseph, of „ Aug. 23, 1713.
Josiah, of Josiah, Oct. 11, 1713.
Lydia, of „ Oct. 11, 1713.
Mary, of „ Mar. 26, 1721.

BALL.

1725 Sept. 19. Edward.

Mary, of „ Apr. 12, 1702.
Edward, of Ed. Sept. 27, 1713.
John, of „ Nov. 8, 1713.
Jeremiah, of Edw., Oct. 13, 1717.

BALLANTINE.

1690 July 27. Susanna.

BALLARD.

Rebeckah, of „ Apr. 9, 1710.
Jane, of John, Jan. 13, 1711[2
Mary, of Joseph, Aug. 17, 1712.
Martha, of „ Jan. 17, 1713[4
Ebenezer, of „ Sept. 11, 1715.

BANKS.

Zacheus, of Mehet., July 31, 1698.

BANT.

1731 Dec. 12. Gilbert.

Gilbert, of „ Oct. 20, 1695.
William, of „ Feb. 5, 1698[9
Elizabeth, of „ July 13, 1701.

BAR.

1703 Oct. 17. John.

Samuel, of John and
Margt., Oct. 8, 1704.
Mehetabel, of „ „ June 6, 1708.

BARBER.

1693 Sept. 24. John.

John, of John, Oct. 15, 1693.
Nathaniel, „ Oct. 15, 1693.

Sarah, of John, Oct. 15, 1693.
 Samuel, of ,, Mar. 10, 1695.
 Sarah, of May 16, 1703.

BARKER.

1714 Feb. 13. Lydia.
 1727 Nov. 19. Abigail.
 1770 Feb. 18. Mary.

BARLEY.

1714 May 9. Israel.

BARNARD.

1667 Oct. 20. Matthew.
 1705[6 Feb. 17. James.
 1718 Mar. 23. Thomas.
 1718 Mar. 23. Silence.
 1733 June 24. Hannah.
 1737[8 Jan. 29. Mercy.
 1738 Apr. 30. Deborah.

William, of John, Aug. 30, 1691.
 Jonathan, of ,, Jan. 15, 1692[3
 Matthew, of ,, June 17, 1694.
 Elizabeth, of K., Sept. 17, 1693.
 Mary, of Aug. 21, 1696.
 Richard, of Mar. 26, 1699.
 Mary, of L. Sept. 28, 1701.
 Benjamin, of Kath., Sept. 5, 1703.
 Elizabeth, of James, Jan. 19, 1706[7
 Esther, of ,, Aug. 28, 1709.
 Mary, of ,, Sept. 2, 1711.
 Hannah, of ,, May 24, 1713.
 Mary, of ,, Jan. 30, 1714[5
 James, of ,, Feb. 12, 1715[6
 William, of ,, Mar. 2, 1718.
 John, of ,, Aug. 2, 1719.
 Mercy, of ,, Mar. 5, 1721.
 Mehetable, of ,, Aug. 5, 1722.
 Thomas, of Thomas, Feb. 15, 1707[8
 Elizabeth, of ,, Dec. 17, 1710.
 Elizabeth, of ,, July 12, 1713.
 John, of ,, Apr. 13, 1718.
 John, of ,, June 10, 1722.
 Silence, of Oct. 16, 1715.
 Mary, of July 31, 1720.
 Elizabeth, of Nov. 27, 1724.
 Mar. 21, 1725.
 Hannah, of July 3, 1726.
 John, of Hannah, Apr. 28, 1728.
 David, of ,, Apr. 16, 1732.
 Samuel, of R., Aug. 4, 1734.

BARNES.

1655 Nov. 9, to
 June 3, 1657. Matthew.

BARNSDALE.

William, of Aug. 27, 1699.

BAR(R)EL(L).

1727 Sept. 17. Hannah.

Mary, of Isabella, July 1, 1694.
 Elizabeth, of ,, Nov. 22, 1696.
 Abiah, of Abiah, July 19, 1702.
 Anna, of Jan. 30, 1703[4
 John, of Aug. 10, 1707.
 Abiah, of Abiah, May 29, 1709.

BARRET.

1702 Mar. 8. John.

John, of May 20, 1705.
 John, of John, Dec. 21, 1707.
 Elizabeth, of May 14, 1710.

BARRINGTON.

Thomas, of Sarah, Sept. 27, 1713.
 Susannah, of Aug. 20, 1721.

BARTER.

1714[5 Jan. 23. James.

Elizabeth, of James, Nov. 20, 1715.
 Joseph, of ,, June 30, 1717.
 Eliza, of ,, Jan. 3, 1719[0

BARTHEL.

1729 July 27. William.

BARTON.

1695 Mar. 17. Margaret.

James, of Kath., Oct. 18, 1713.
 John, of Aug. 28, 1715.
 Samuel, of Sept. 29, 1717.

BASS.

Mary, of Apr. 8, 1694.
 Elizabeth, of Apr. 28, 1695.
 Zechariah, of July 12, 1696.
 of Jan. 15, 1698[9

BATTERSBY.

Mary, of Nov. 9, 1712.

BEAL.

1678 Nov. 17. S.

BEAN(s), or BEEN.

1728 Nov. 17. Deliverance.

William, of Deliv'ce, Jan. 26, 1728[9
 Ann, of ,, Nov. 1, 1730.
 Deliverance, of ,, July 9, 1732.
 Caleb, of ,, Aug. 3, 1735.
 Robinson, of ,, Nov. 13, 1737.

BEARD, or BAIRD.

1701 July 27. S. Abiah.

William, of William, Jan. 9, 1725[6
 Elizabeth, of Eliza, Mar. 12, 1727.
 Mary, of William and
 Eliza, Aug. 11, 1728.
 Susannah, of Deborah, Oct. 9, 1737.
 Deborah, of „ Aug. 5, 1739.

BEDDINGTON, or BEDLINGTON.

Margaret, of Jan. 18, 1718[9
 John, of Jan. 8, 1720[1

BEIGHTON.

1681 Mar. 1. Samuel.
 1681 Nov. 6. Ann.

James, of Samuel, Mar. 30, 1690.
 Ebenezer, of Samuel
 and Ann, Oct. 2, 1692.

BELCHER.

1714 Mar. 14. David.

Thomas, of Susan'h, Dec. 9, 1722.
 John, of May 30, 1725.
 Susanna, of Apr. 23, 1727.
 Mary, of David, Sept. 4, 1726.
 David, of „ Aug. 4, 1728.
 Samuel, of July 11, 1731.

BELL.

1727[8 Feb. 11. Daniel.
 1727[8 Feb. 11. Abigail.
 1782 Sept. 8. William.
 1794 Desire.
 1794 Prudence.
 Prior to 1786 Thomas.

Daniel, of Daniel, May 6, 1711.
 David, of „ June 7, 1713.
 Abigail, of Oct. 10, 1714.
 Hannah, of Mar. 31, 1717.
 John, of Daniel, Mar. 8, 1719.
 Sarah, of „ Aug. 20, 1721.
 Martha, of Jan. 27, 1722[3
 Katherine, of Feb. 21, 1724[5
 Thomas, of Daniel, Apr. 23, 1727.
 Samuel, of „ May 4, 1729.
 William, of „ Apr. 11, 1731.
 Elizabeth, of „ Aug. 18, 1734.
 Deborah, of „ Jan. 30, 1736[7

BENJAMIN.

1680 Aug. 29. S.
 1680 Nov. 7. John.

BENMORE.

1681. Sept. 18. Eliza.

BENNET.

1655 Nov. 9, to June
 3, 1657. S.
 1672 Sept. 7. B.
 1727 Nov. 12. Mary.
 1727[8 Jan. 7. Elizabeth.

John, of May 18, 1707.
 Mary, of June 29, 1707.
 William, of Mar. 26, 1710.
 Elizabeth, of Eliza, Jan. 11, 1729[0
 John, of „ June 4, 1732.
 Ellis, of Sarah, Mar. 11, 1733.
 William, of John, June 18, 1738.
 Hannah, of „ Mar. 9, 1740.

BENNING.

Sarah, of John, Nov. 28, 1708.
 John, of „ Dec. 5, 1708.

BENTLEY.

1776 William.

BERNARD.

1664 Aug. 21. S.
 1678 Apr. 14. John.
 1680 Thomas.
 1683 July 15. Esther.
 1691 May 17. Catharin.
 1692 Mar. 20. Hanna.
 1716 May 13. Eliza.
 1716 July 8. John.
 1718 May 11. Sarah.

Cath., of Catharine, May 24, 1691.
 Thomas, of John, Aug. 19, 1716.

BERRY.

1673 July 3. Thomas.
 1673 Nov. 2. S.
 1687[8 Feb. 19. Thorn.
 1701 Dec. 14. Mary.

Margaret, of Margt., June 26, 1692.
 Thomas, of „ Mar. 24, 1695.
 Anna, of Mary, May 1, 1698.
 Henry, of „ Feb. 4, 1699[0
 Daniel, of „ Nov. 16, 1701.
 Ebenezer, of Dec. 19, 1703.
 Mary, of Feb. 29, 1707[8

BEVIS.

1681[2 S.

BILL.

1670 Thomas.

1673 Dec. 6. S.
 1676[7 Jan. 16. James.
 1676[7 Feb. 23. S.
 1701 Dec. 14. Theodosia.
 1725 Oct. 10. Frances (bapt.)

Hanna, of June 21, 1691.
 Abigl., of Theodosia, Apr. 11, 1697.
 Susanna, of „ Aug. 11, 1700.
 William, of Wm., Nov. 16, 1712.
 Ann, of May 24, 1713.
 William, of Mar. 28, 1714.
 Susannah, of May 20, 1716.

BILLINGS.
 1670 S.

BINGHAM.
 Prior to 1786 Hannah.

BIRD.
 1719 Apr. 5. Joseph.

BISHOP.
 1693 June 10. Hanna.

BLAGUE.
 1678 Nov. 3. S.

Newcomb, of Apr. 4, 1697.
 Newcomb, of Apr. 24, 1698.
 Susannah, of Mar. 31, 1700.
 Mary, of Mar. 22, 1702.
 Philip, of Aug. 18, 1706.

BLAIR.
 1708 Mar. 21. Ann.
 William, of July 20, 1712.

BLAKE.
 1665 June 4. Edward.
 1706 Mar. 24. Solomon.
 1742 Abigail.

Solomon, { twins } June 1, 1707.
 Abigail, { of Sol., }
 Joseph, of Solomon, Aug. 14, 1709.
 Elizabeth, of „ July 22, 1711.
 Hannah, of „ June 21, 1713.
 Sarah, of „ Jan. 2, 1714[5
 Solomon, of „ Sept. 2, 1716.
 Edward, of „ Aug. 16, 1719.
 Jonathan, of „ June 4, 1721.
 John, of „ May 5, 1723.
 William, of „ Mar. 28, 1725.
 Hannah, of „ Dec. 8, 1728.

BLANCH.
 1780 Jan. 6. Rebecca.

BLOWERS.

Sarah, of Sarah, Sept. 5, 1736.
 Martha, of „ Dec. 24, 1738.
 Emma, of Mar. 15, 1741.

BOARDMAN.

1771 Mar. 31. William.

BODILY.

Bell, of Abigail, July 24, 1715.

BOINTON, or BOYNTON.

Samuel, of Isaac, Apr. 7, 1723.
 Isaac, of „ June 6, 1725.
 Jacob, of „ Nov. 30, 1729.

BOND.

1689 Dec. 1. Grimstone.

BONGARDEN.

Ruth, of Aug. 31, 1712.

BOON(E).

1683 Apr. 15. S.

Elizabeth, of N., July 16, 1704.
 Nicholas, of Nicholas, Feb. 10, 1705[6

BOREL.

1688 Martha.
 1688[9 Feb. 17. Samuel.

Deborah, of Samuel
 and Martha, Feb. 1, 1690[1
 Samuel, of „ „ Apr. 23, 1693.
 Katherine, of „ „ Sept. 14, 1695.
 Michael, of „ „ Oct. 3, 1697.
 John, of Samuel, Oct. 22, 1699.
 Isabella, of „ Sept. 7, 1701.
 Samuel, of „ Apr. 23, 1704.
 Nathanael, of Jan. 7, 1710[1

BORMAN.

1716 Sept. 22. Isaac.

BOSWORTH.

Joseph, of Mary, Dec. 16, 1716.
 Ephraim, of Sept. 4, 1720.
 Robert, of Sept. 16, 1722.

BOUCHER.

Elizabeth, of Feb. 28, 1724[5
 Mary, of July 24, 1726.

BOULDERSON.

William, of June 11, 1721.
 Sarah, of Jan. 6, 1722[3

BOWDEN.
1734[5 Jan. 5. John.
Mary, of John, Jan. 5, 1734[5

BOWLES.
Hannah, of Aug. 5, 1711.

BOWMAN.
1714[5 Jan. 23. Margaret.

Sarah, of Mary, Feb. 6, 1714[5
Susannah, of,, Feb. 6, 1714[5

BOYD.
Mary, of May 28, 1710.

BOYDEN.
1693 Sept. 24. Elizabeth.

BRACKENBURY.
1677 Nov. 4. Samuel.

Samuel, of Samuel, May 12, 1700.

BREAM(E). (BRIAN?)
1672 Sept. 7. S.
Ann, of Elizabeth, July 28, 1695.
Elizabeth, of,, Apr. 11, 1697.
Sarah, of Aug. 27, 1699.
Benjamin, of Jan. 26, 1700[1

BRECK.
1700 Dec. 15. John.
1708 Apr. 18. Ann.
1727 Nov. 12. Martha.
1728 Apr. 7. John.
1728 Apr. 7. Margaret.
1768 Nov. 6. Daniel.

John, of John, Sept. 2, 1705.
Samuel, of,, Mar. 6, 1709.
Edmund, ,, June 17, 1711.
Robert, of July 20, 1707.
Martha, of Nathl., Mar. 13, 1709.
Sarah, of,, Nov. 26, 1710.
Nathanael, of N., May 17, 1713.
Ann, of John and
Mary, Oct. 20, 1728.
Margaret, of John
and Margaret, Aug. 23, 1730.
John, of,, Feb. 10, 1733[4
Elizabeth, ,, May 1, 1737.
Ann, of,, Aug. 20, 1738.
Hannah, ,, May 4, 1740.
Abigail, of John, June 18, 1732.
Nathaniel, of,, Feb. 1, 1735[6
John, of Robert, June 10, 1733.

Robert, of Robert, Feb. 23, 1734[5
Ann, of,, Feb. 29, 1735[6
Rebeckah, ,, Sept. 17, 1738.
Samuel, of,, June 22, 1740.

BREED.
1723 May 12. Sarah.
1723 June 9. Nathaniel.
1727 Nov. 12. Eunice.
1741 Aug. 9. Elizabeth.

Joseph, of Timo., Oct. 16, 1709.
Mary, of Sarah, Jan. 15, 1709[0
Eunice, of Aug. 3, 1712.
Nathanael, of July 26, 1713.
Timothy, of Mar. 27, 1715.
Lois, of Sept. 2, 1716.
Allen, of Aug. 11, 1717.
Sarah, of Aug. 11, 1717.
Timothy, of Mar. 9, 1718.
William, of May 10, 1719.
Mary, of Mar. 31, 1723.
Allen, of Nathl., Aug. 27, 1721.
Sarah, of Nathl. and
Sarah, June 30, 1723.
Eliza, of,, June 30, 1723.
John, of Nathl. Aug. 28, 1726.
John, of Timothy, Aug. 21, 1726.
Sarah, of Eunice, Apr. 20, 1729.
Nathaniel, of Elizab., Sept. 28, 1741.

BREEDEN.
1669 May 16. S.

BREWSTER.
1704 Oct. 15. John.

Deliverance, of John, Sept. 22, 1706.
Ann, of,, Apr. 4, 1708.
Ann, of,, May 21, 1710.
Mary, of,, Mar. 9, 1712.
Sarah, of,, Nov. 20, 1715.
John, of,, Feb. 9, 1717[8
Matthew, of,, Jan. 14, 1721.
Hannah, of July 31, 1720.

BRICKNAL.
1683 Nov. 25. Edward.
1689 Dec. 19. S.

BRIDGE.
1715 Mar. 13. Mary.
1718[9 Feb. 15. Abigail.

William, of Sarah, Aug. 24, 1707.
Mary, of Mary, Mar. 18, 1711.
Hannah, of June 14, 1713.
Ebenezer, of Mar. 11, 1716.
Sarah, of Mar. 23, 1718.

Experience, of July 23, 1721.

BRIDGES.
1693 Nov. 12. Mary.

BRIDGHAM.
1725 Apr. 11. Joseph.
1727 Dec. 24. Mercy.

Joseph, of Joseph, Dec. 1, 1723.
Abigail, of .. Nov. 22, 1724.
Mercy, of .. Jan. 2, 1725[6
Eliza, of .. July 30, 1727.
Sarah, of .. Sept. 22, 1728.
John, of .. Aug. 31, 1729.
Joseph, of .. Aug. 1, 1731.

BRIGENDEN.
1673 July 2. S.

BRIGGS.
1722 Apr. 8. Deborah.
1727 Dec. 3. Sarah (bapt.).

BRIGHTMAN.
Joseph, of Lydia, Aug. 26, 1739.

BRINDSEN.
1679 Sept. 14. S.

BRINTNAL.
1701 Oct. 5. Caleb.

BRISCO.
1688[9 Feb. 24. Rebecca.

BRISTOE.
1691 July to Sept., Daniel.

BRONSDON, or BRUNSDON.
1693[4 Jan. 21. Robert.

Mercy, of Benjamin, Feb. 6, 1708[9
Mary, of .. Aug. 13, 1710.
Rebeckah, of .. Apr. 13, 1712.
Robert, of .. July 12, 1713.
Gilbert, of .. Feb. 27, 1714[5
Benjamin, of .. Mar. 4, 1716.
Robert, of .. Aug. 11, 1717.
William, of .. Apr. 12, 1719.
William, of .. May 8, 1720.
of .. Nov. 5, 1721.
Robert, of .. Mar. 10, 1723.
William, of .. July 5, 1724.
Mary, of .. Dec. 19, 1725.
Sarah, of .. Feb. 26, 1726[7
William, of .. June 16, 1728.
Elizabeth, of .. Dec. 7, 1729.
Rebecca, of .. Nov. 28, 1731.

BROOKS.
1655 Nov. 9, to
June 3, 1657. B.
1718 May 11. Thomas.
1727 Dec. 3. Sarah (bapt.).

Sarah, of May 3, 1719.
Mary, of Jan. 29, 1720[1
Thomas, of Sept. 15, 1723.
Elizabeth, of Thos., Feb. 26, 1726[7
Jane, of .. Dec. 5, 1731.

BROUGHTON.
1663[4 Jan. 31. S.
1698 Mar. 13. Thomas.
1706 Aug. 11. Hannah.
1706 Aug. 11. Sarah.

BROWN(E).
1714 Mar. 14. Jonathan.
1714 Mar. 14. Lois.
1725 May 2. William.
1725 May 2. Ann.
1727[8 Jan. 7. Jonathan.
1727[8 Jan. 7. Josiah.
1732 Nov. 12. Ebenezer.
Prior to 1786. Ebenezer, jun.
Prior to 1786. Thankful.
1772 Sept. Ephraim H.

William, of Ann, Nov. 7, 1697.
John, of July 7, 1700.
Mary, of Benjamin, Dec. 13, 1702.
Benjamin, of July 4, 1703.
Abigail, of Feb. 10, 1705[6
Ann, of June 23, 1706.
Jonathan, of Lois, Dec. 14, 1707.
Benjamin, of Benj., May 30, 1708.
Abigail, of .. Apr. 16, 1710.
Hannah, of .. June 1, 1712.
Joseph, of .. Jan. 31, 1713[4
Timothy, of Nov. 7, 1708.
Josiah, of Apr. 23, 1710.
Samuel, of Oct. 21, 1711.
Sarah, of June 1, 1712.
Nathaniel, of Sept. 12, 1714.
John, of Oct. 24, 1714.
Ebenezer, of May 7, 1716.
Joseph, of Aug. 10, 1718.
Lois, of Dec. 30, 1722.
John, of Sept. 17, 1738.
Ebenezer, of Wm., Aug. 3, 1718.
Lois, of Jona., May 1, 1720.
Elizab., of .. Sept. 11, 1726.
Elizabeth, of Jona.
and Eliza, May 26, 1734.
Jonathan, of Jona. jun., Apr. 18, 1736.
Ebenezer, of Jona., Feb. 12, 1737[8
Josiah, of .. Mar. 30, 1740.

Mary, of Aug. 7, 1737.
 Nathaniel, of Jona., Oct. 2, 1737.
 Ebenezer, of Eben., June 7, 1741.

BRUER.

1725 May 30. George.

Sarah, of George, Jan. 30, 1725[6]
 Abigail, of „ Dec. 3, 1727.
 Elizabeth, of Susan
 and George, Feb. 14, 1730[1]

BRUNTON.

Lydia, of Thomas, Feb. 24, 1711[2]
 Thomas, of „ Sept. 21, 1718.
 Dorothy, of „ Apr. 26, 1713.
 Mary, of June 30, 1717.
 Eliza, of Oct. 2, 1720.

BRYANT.

1742 Eunice.

BUCK(H)ANAN.

1700 June 16. John.
 1724 Apr. 5. Elizabeth.

Elizabeth, of John, Dec. 9, 1694.
 Mary, of „ Dec. 9, 1694.
 Huldah, of „ Feb. 12, 1698[9]
 Thomas, of „ Dec. 29, 1700.
 Huldah, of „ Mar. 7, 1703.
 Clark, of „ Feb. 25, 1704[5]
 Ann, of „ July 13, 1707.
 Sarah, of „ Dec. 19, 1708.
 Elizabeth, of „ Dec. 12, 1725.
 Esther, of Esther, Mar. 24, 1728.

BUCKLE(Y), or BULKE(Y).

1691 July to Sept., Joanna.
 1729 May 24. Mary.

Thomas, of Oct. 13, 1700.
 Mary, of Hannah, July 26, 1702.
 Mary, of Mary, June 8, 1729.
 Susanna, of „ June 7, 1730.
 Joseph, of „ Jan. 16, 1731[2]
 Richard, of „ Oct. 21, 1733.
 Richard, of „ Feb. 2, 1734[5]
 Joanna, of „ May 22, 1737.
 Abigail, of „ July 8, 1739.
 John, of „ Nov. 16, 1740.

BUCKLIN.

Hannah, of Hannah, Oct. 19, 1707.

BURBANK.

Jane, of Reb., Aug. 9, 1702.
 Timothy, of Oct. 17, 1703.

John, of Jan. 21, 1704[5]
 Samuel, of Oct. 20, 1705.

BURNAM.

Susannah, of Jonat., Oct. 30, 1709.

BURNEL, or BURNAL.

1727 Apr. 2. Samuel.
 1727 Apr. 2. Ann.

Elizabeth, of Mar. 30, 1707.
 Rebeckah, of Feb. 13, 1708[9]
 Ann, of June 10, 1711.
 Susannah, of July 29, 1711.
 Ann, of Aug. 30, 1713.
 Elizabeth, of Sept. 6, 1713.
 Sarah, of Nov. 6, 1715.
 Samuel, of Feb. 10, 1716[7]
 Sarah, of Jonathan, Oct. 20, 1717.
 Lydia, of July 19, 1719.
 Eliza, of Jan. 17, 1719[0]

BURNETT.

Deborah, of Dec. 16, 1705.

BURNLY.

Edward, of Eliza, Aug. 21, 1720.

BURRIL(L).

1710 Mar. 19. Mary.
 1714 Aug. 1. Sarah.

John, of Samuel, Mar. 17, 1706.
 John, of Mary, Mar. 26, 1710.
 George, of „ Mar. 26, 1710.
 James, of „ Mar. 26, 1710.
 Elizabeth, of „ Mar. 26, 1710.
 Theophil., of „ Mar. 26, 1710.
 Jonathan, of Jona., Nov. 14, 1714.
 Samuel, of Sept. 25, 1715.
 Mary, of Mary, Dec. 23, 1733.
 George, of „ May 18, 1735.

BURROUGHS.

1682 Apr. 9. S.
 1717 May 19. William.

BURTON.

1715 Mar. 13. Joanna.

BUSTER.

1703[4 Jan. 23. Matthew.

BUSHEL(L).

1714 Feb. 20. John.

Rebeckah, of Rebec., Aug. 16, 1713.
 John, of John, Mar. 20, 1715.

Rebeckah, of John Feb. 9, 1717[8
Mary, of „ Nov. 3, 1723.

BUSHNEL.

1699 May 28. Sarah.
Jane, of Sarah, June 4, 1699.
John, of „ June 4, 1699.
William, of „ June 4, 1699.
Thomas, of „ June 4, 1699.
John, of „ June 17, 1711.
Rebeckah, of „ Oct. 12, 1712.
Sarah, of „ Feb. 6, 1714[5
Gustan, of „ May 18, 1718.
Mary, of „ Jan. 24, 1719[0
Gustan, of „ Apr. 2, 1721.
Thomas, of „ July 30, 1721.
Thomas, of „ Sept. 2, 1722.
Hannah, of „ Nov. 8, 1724.

BUTLER. (See BUSTER.)

1711[2 Feb. 24. Sarah.
1778 Aug. 16. Sarah.
Susannah, of Matth., Nov. 27, 1709.
John, of „ Dec. 31, 1710.
Joseph, of „ Jan. 3, 1713[4

BUTT.

Mary, of Mary, Aug. 1, 1703.

BYLES.

1696 Oct. 11. Josiah.
1725 Apr. 18. Mather.
Samuel, of Josiah, Oct. 11, 1696.
James, of „ Oct. 8, 1699.
Sarah, of „ Sept. 28, 1701.
Samuel, of „ Feb. 7, 1702[3
Mather, of Josias
and Elizab., Mar. 16, 1707.

CANNON.

1693 June 10. Sara.
1704 Oct. 1. Sarah.
1708[9 Feb. 13. Andrews.
John, of John, Jan. 31, 1702[3
John, of Andrew, Aug. 22, 1703.
Elizabeth, of Andros, Oct. 29, 1710.
Sarah, of „ Mar. 24, 1706.
Mary, of „ Nov. 30, 1712.
Andrews, of „ Dec. 5, 1714.

CAN(N)OWAY.

1694 Apr. 1. Sarah.
1725 Mar. 28. Sarah.
Sarah, of Sarah, Apr. 1, 1694.

CARLISLE.

Hannah, of Hannah, July 28, 1695.
Sarah, of „ July 28, 1695.
Elizabeth, of „ July 28, 1695.
John, of „ Apr. 11, 1697.
Thomas, of „ June 14, 1702.
Rachel, of „ Mar. 25, 1705.

CARY.

1770 Oct. 7. Elizabeth.
Sarah, of „ Feb. 9, 1723[4

CASTELL.

1681[2 Joan.

CASWELL.

1725 June 27. Jane.
John, of Jane, Aug. 1, 1725.
Thos., of „ Aug. 1, 1725.
Collar, of „ Aug. 1, 1725.
Hannah, of „ Aug. 1, 1725.

CAUPHIN.

Gard, of Christian, May 2, 1697.
Lydia, of „ Aug. 6, 1699.
Daniel, of Ann, Jan. 26, 1706[7

CENTER.

1691[2 Feb. 7. Ruth.
Ruth, of Ruth, May 15, 1692.
Sarah, of „ July 20, 1695.
Jeremiah, of „ June 20, 1697.

CHADWICK.

John, of Mercy, Apr. 9, 1704.

CHAMBERLA(1)N.

1689[0 Feb. 23. Joanna.
1690 Mar. 8. Job.
1715[6 John.
Job, of Joanna, Feb. 23, 1689[0
William, of „ Feb. 23, 1689[0
Elizabeth, of „ Feb. 23, 1689[0
Susannah, of Job, Nov. 26, 1693.
Mary, of „ Dec. 8, 1695.
Jane, of „ Mar. 31, 1706.

CHAMBRAY.

of Margaret, July 28, 1695.

CHAMPLIN, or CHAMPLEY.

1732 Mar. 5. Martha.
William, of Martha, Sept. 3, 1704.
Mary, of „ May 15, 1709.

Elizabeth, of Feb. 1, 1707[8
 Charles, of Oct. 29, 1710.
 Phillip, of Jan. 11, 1712[3
 Martha, of July 10, 1715.
 John, of Jan. 26, 1717[8
 Elizabeth, of Martha, Feb. 21, 1719[0
 John, of Sept. 29, 1723.
 Charles, of Martha, July 11, 1725.
 John, } twins, of,, July 30, 1727.
 Mary, }

CHAMPNEY.

1776 July. Sarah.

CHANDLER.

1693 May or June, Mehetabel.

Ann, of Mar. 30, 1740.

CHANNING.

John, of Dec. 19, 1714.
 Mary, of John, May 5, 1717.
 Ann, of ,, Nov. 8, 1719.

CHAP(H)IN.

1690 Sept. 7. Elizabeth.

Elizab., of Elizabeth, May 7, 1693.
 Mary, of ,, July 1, 1694.
 Elizabeth, of Mar. 8, 1696.
 Ruth, of June 1, 1701.

CHARD.

1673 July 3. S.
 1679 July 6. Thomas.
 1694[5 Feb. 17. Hugh.

CHARNOCK.

1708 Dec. 5. Mary.
 1710 Nov. 5. John.
 1722 Nov. 25. Hannah.
 1726 Dec. 12. Elizabeth.
 1727 Dec. 10. S.
 John, of Mary, Mar. 22, 1702.
 William, of Apr. 2, 1704.
 Richard, of Nov. 4, 1705.
 Elizabeth, of Sept. 14, 1707.
 Mary, of Mar. 12, 1710.
 Stephen, of John, Sept. 7, 1712.
 Richard, of ,, Feb. 7, 1713[4
 Stephen, of ,, Apr. 17, 1715.
 Joanna, of ,, May 12, 1717.
 George, of ,, Jan. 11, 1718[9
 William, of ,, Feb. 17, 1722[3
 John, of Emma, June 12, 1726.
 Thomas, of ,, Nov. 12, 1727.

CHECKLEY.

1670 S.
 1693 Sept. 24. Ann.
 1747 SAMUEL, jun.
 (from New North Church.)
 1781 Nov. 4. Ann.
 Prior to 1786. Elizabeth.

CHEEVER.

1712 May 18. Joshua.

CH(E)UTE.

Mary, of Aug. 30, 1713.
 James, of Jan. 2, 1714[5
 Mary, of Nov. 11, 1716.

CHRISTIE.

Rachel, of Feb. 4, 1721[2

CLARK(E).

1670 S.
 1675 Aug. 8. S.
 1677 June 1. { Jonas.
 { Susanna.
 1677[8 Jan. 20. S.
 1681 Sept. 18. John.
 1691 June or July. John.
 1694 Apr. 8. Sarah.
 1702 Mar. 8. Samuel.
 1702 Aug. 6. Abigail.
 1711 Feb. 24. Sarah.
 1721 May 7. Susanna.
 1721[2 Jan. 7. Martha.
 1727[8 Jan. 14. Sarah.
 1727[8 Jan. 14. Elizabeth.
 Prior to 1786. Jonas.

Mary, of John, Feb. 14, 1691[2
 Sarah, of ,, Sept. 24, 1693.
 Martha, of John

and Sarah, Mar. 31, 1695.
 Mary, of John, Mar. 21, 1697.
 John, of ,, Dec. 18, 1698.
 William, of ,, Aug. 16, 1702.
 Sarah, of ,, Jan. 23, 1703[4
 Martha, of ,, June 30, 1706.
 Sarah, of John
 and Sarah, May 16, 1708.
 Elizabeth, of ,, ,, Mar. 4, 1711.
 Ann, ,, ,, July 19, 1713.
 Sarah, of William, Feb. 21, 1702[3
 William, of ,, July 23, 1704.
 William, of ,, Nov. 4, 1705.
 John, of ,, Feb. 2, 1706[7
 Sarah, of ,, July 18, 1708.
 Rebeckah, of ,, Apr. 30, 1710.
 Martha, of ,, May 13, 1711.
 John, of ,, Mar. 8, 1713.
 Elizabeth, of ,, Dec. 26, 1714.

Robert, of William, Apr. 22, 1716.
 Elizabeth, of „ Sept. 15, 1717.
 Benjamin, of „ Aug. 10, 1718.
 Mary, of „ Nov. 1, 1719.
 Dorothy, of „ Jan. 1, 1720[1
 Richard, of „ July 15, 1722.
 Mary, of Samuel, Apr. 16, 1704.
 Wm. } twins of „ May 12, 1706.
 John }
 John, of „ Oct. 12, 1707.
 Abigail, of „ Sept. 10, 1710.
 William, of „ Dec. 28, 1712.
 Elizabeth, of „ Apr. 24, 1715.
 Josiah, of Priscilla, Dec. 3, 1710.
 Priscilla, of Dec. 7, 1712.
 Josiah, of Jan. 17, 1713[4
 John, of Sarah, Oct. 28, 1711.
 Hannah, of Martha, Feb. 11, 1721[2
 Jonas, of Margaret, Aug. 7, 1726.
 Abigail, of „ Sept. 29, 1728.
 John, of „ May 6, 1733.
 Samuel, of Oct. 14, 1694.
 Sarah, of Apr. 5, 1696.
 James, of Dec. 5, 1697.
 John, of Oct. 22, 1699.
 William, of Oct. 26, 1701.
 Elizabeth, of Jan. 23, 1714[5
 Joseph, of Aug. 26, 1716.
 Rebeckah, of Feb. 23, 1717[8
 Margaret, of Aug. 9, 1719.
 Margaret, of Aug. 18, 1723.

CLERK.

1685 Dec. 27. George.
 Gamaliel, of July 28, 1717.

CLEMENTS.

Abraham, of Anna, Feb. 8, 1729[0
 Nathaniel, of „ Feb. 8, 1729[0
 Anna, of „ Feb. 8, 1729[0
 Susanna, of „ Feb. 8, 1729[0
 Sarah, of „ Feb. 8, 1729[0

CLEMY.

Alexander, of El. July 16, 1693.

CLOUGH.

1689 Apr. 7. William.
 1691 Apr. 19. Ebenezer.
 1705 Dec. 23. Lydia.
 1709 Nov. 6. Sarah.
 1743 Samuel.
 1743 Ann.
 1743 Benj.
 1769 May 29. Mehetabal.
 1786 Newbury.

John, of Eben'r and Martha, Mar. 4, 1694.
 Martha, of „ „ May 26, 1695.
 Mary, of „ „ July 25, 1697.
 Eben'r, of „ „ Mar. 26, 1699.
 Ebenezer, of Eben'r, Jan. 31, 1702[3
 William, of „ Feb. 23, 1706[7
 Susannah, of „ Aug. 28, 1709.
 Mary, of „ July 1, 1711.
 Edward, of „ June 21, 1713.
 Elizabeth, of „ Oct. 3, 1714.
 Nathani. of Joseph, Aug. 31, 1707.
 Ruth, of Ruth, Dec. 7, 1707.
 William, of „ Dec. 7, 1707.
 Susannah, of „ Dec. 7, 1707.
 James, of „ Dec. 7, 1707.
 Abigail, of „ Dec. 7, 1707.
 Mary, of „ Dec. 7, 1707.
 Elizabeth, of „ Dec. 7, 1707.
 Joseph, of B., Oct. 4, 1719.
 William, of „ Oct. 4, 1719.
 Lydia, of „ Oct. 4, 1719.
 Sarah, of Sarah, Apr. 2, 1727.
 Benj., of Mehetabal, Feb. 1, 1729[0
 Mary, of Eliza, Oct. 10, 1736.
 (formerly Fryer.)
 Newberry, of Eliza, Dec. 3, 1738.
 Ellis, of Joseph, Apr. 15, 1739.
 Ellis, of Mar. 8, 1741.
 Nathanael, of Nov. 27, 1692.
 Priscilla, of Apr. 21, 1695.
 Ebenezer, of Dec. 12, 1697.
 John, of May 21, 1704.
 John, of Mar. 18, 1711.
 Ann, of Feb. 28, 1713[4
 Mehetabel, of Apr. 22, 1716.
 Joseph, of Apr. 13, 1718.
 Samuel, of Feb. 21, 1719[0
 Bethiah, of July 16, 1721.
 Bethiah, of Apr. 28, 1723.
 Mehetable, of Mar. 31, 1723.
 Benjamin, of Jan. 26, 1728[9
 Ebenezer, of Apr. 16, 1732.

COAMS.

Andrew, of Martha, Feb. 13, 1714[5
 Joseph, of Mercy, Dec. 9, 1716.

Co(AR)DS.

Elizabeth, of Rachel, Jan. 27, 1705[6
 Rachel, of „ Oct. 2, 1709.
 Samuel, of Mar. 16, 1712.

COBBET.

1709 May 22. John.
 John, of Feb. 4, 1721[2

		COCK(s).
1672	Sept. 7.	B.
1691	May 17.	Nicholas.
1691	May 17.	Sara.
1727	Dec. 10.	Mary (bapt.).
1733	Mar. 4.	Andrew.

Sarah, of Richard		
	and Sarah, Jan. 10, 1696[7	
Mary, of Mary,	Aug. 7, 1698.	
Margaret, of,,	Aug. 28, 1698.	
Elizabeth, of Nich.	May 25, 1701.	
Joseph, of Elizabeth,	Mar. 25, 1733.	
Mary, of Robert,	Mar. 20, 1737.	
Hannah, of Andrew,	Apr. 8, 1739.	
Ann, of	Feb. 11, 1699[0	
James, of	Aug. 13, 1704.	
Mary, of	July 10, 1715.	
John, of	Dec. 17, 1721.	
Abigail, of	Mar. 29, 1741.	

		CODNER.
1725	Mar. 14.	James.
1727[8	Feb. 11.	Mary.
1773	Nov.	Mary.
Mary, of Mary,		
	Mar. 7, 1703.	
James, of ,,	Nov. 12, 1704.	
John, of ,,	Dec. 22, 1706.	
William, of	July 24, 1709.	
Elizabeth, of	Feb. 10, 1711[2	
Hannah, of	Dec. 5, 1714.	
Elizabeth, of James,	July 20, 1729.	
Elizabeth, of ,,	Aug. 23, 1730.	
James, of ,,	Dec. 5, 1731.	
Mary, of ,,	Apr. 4, 1736.	

		COFFIN.
William, of	Aug. 14, 1715.	

		COLE.
1655	Nov. 9 to	
	June 3, 1657.	S.

		COLEFIX.
Phinehas, of	Mar. 10, 1728.	

		COL(E)MAN.
1670		S.
1688	July 6.	William.
1688	July 6.	Elizabeth.
1693	May or June.	Benjamin.

John, of Judith,	Feb. 28, 1696[7	
William, of	Dec. 18, 1698.	

		COLLICOT.
1660[1	Feb. 17.	•Richard.

1660[1	Feb. 17.	S.
1676[7	Jan. 16.	Bethiah.

		COLLINS.
1695	June 30.	Hanna.
1727[8	Jan. 7.	Rebecca.
1735	Nov. 23.	Clement.

Daniel, of Daniel,	Sept. 28, 1696.	
Rebeckah, of ,,	Sept. 28, 1696.	
Deborah, of ,,	Mar. 5, 1699.	
Samuel, of ,,	July 27, 1701.	
Clement, of ,,	May 13, 1704.	
Samuel, of ,,	Sept. 15, 1706.	
Rebeckah, of ,,	Mar. 13, 1709.	
Abigail, of ,,	Apr. 20, 1712.	
Daniel, of ,,	Feb. 23, 1717[8	
Mary, of	Dec. 5, 1708.	
Mary, of Mary,	Jan. 30, 1708[9	
John, of Sarah,	Sept. 20, 1730.	
Sarah, of	Nov. 28, 1731.	
Clement, of ,,	Mar. 11, 1733.	
Rebeckah, of,,	Sept. 29, 1734.	
Daniel, of Clement		
	and Sarah, June 6, 1736.	
Anna, of Clemens,	July 16, 1738.	

		COMBEE.
1681	Mar. 1.	Robert.

		COMER.
1683	Nov. 4.	S.

		CONDY, or CUNDY.
1684	June 8.	William.

William, of Chr.,	Aug. 11, 1695.	
Bartlet, of ,,	July 21, 1700.	
William, of Jeremiah,	Aug. 17, 1707.	
Jeremiah, of ,,	Feb. 20, 1708[9	
Elizabeth, of ,,	Mar. 11, 1711.	
Susannah, of ,,	Mar. 14, 1714.	
Mary, of ,,	Dec. 11, 1715.	
Mary, of ,,	Jan. 20, 1716[7	
William, of ,,	Sept. 18, 1720.	
Mary, of ,,	July 4, 1725.	
Joanna, of	Dec. 2, 1716.	
Abigail, of	Nov. 20, 1720.	

		CONEY.
1672	Sept. 7.	John.
1677[8	Jan. 20.	Eliza.
1718[9	Feb. 15.	Ann.
1722	Sept. 30.	Abigail.
1722	Sept. 30.	Mehetabel.

		COOK.
1717	Apr. 7.	Margaret.

Lydia, of Lydia, Aug. 21, 1707.

COOKSON.

1727 Apr. 2. John.
1727 Nov. 12. John.
1727 Nov. 12. Rachel.
1727 Dec. 24. Elizabeth.

John, of July 7, 1706.
Rachel, of Sept. 11, 1707.
Elizabeth, of Oct. 10, 1708.
Obadiah, of Feb. 5, 1709[0
Reuben, of May 13, 1711.
Samuel, of Feb. 3, 1716[7
Margaret, of Margt., June 1, 1740.

COOLEY.

John, of M., Apr. 23, 1693.
Elizabeth, of „ Apr. 23, 1693.
Ezekiel, of „ Apr. 23, 1693.

COOPER.

William, of Sept. 6, 1713.
John, of William, Nov. 6, 1720.
Sarah, of „ Sept. 1, 1723.
William, of „ Oct. 3, 1725.
Abigail, of „ Aug. 20, 1727.
Mary, of „ Dec. 28, 1729.
Jemimah, of „ Apr. 23, 1732.
Dorcas, of „ June 16, 1734.
Elizabeth, of „ May 22, 1737.

COR.

1693 May or June. John.

CORAGIL.

1706[7 Jan. 26 John.

John, of John, Sept. 9, 1716.
James, of „ Sept. 20, 1719.

CORWITHER(V).

1696 June 22. Elizabeth.

David, of Eliz., July 5, 1696.

CORWYN.

1700 Nov. 24. Elizabeth.

CORTON.

1679 Aug. 31. John.
1689 Dec. 8. Ann.

Thomas, of John
and Ann, Apr. 26, 1696.

COUNTS, OR COUNCE.

Susanna, of Edw.
and Sus., Jan. 2, 1731[2

John, of Edw. & Sus., Nov. 18, 1733.
Mary, of „ „ June 29, 1735.
Pierce, „ „ May 29, 1737.
Samuel, of „ „ Aug. 5, 1739.
Hannah { „ „ }
Sarah { twins. } July 19, 1741.

COURSER, OR COARSER.

1735[6 S. Deliverance.

Eliza, of Eliza, Mar. 11, 1739.

COVEL(L).

Jane, of Sept. 10, 1721.
William, of Jan. 6, 1722[3
Thomas, of Aug. 1, 1725.

COVERLY.

1728 June 30. Thomas.
1732 Apr. 9. John.

Thomas, of Mary, June 6, 1708.
Susannah, of June 20, 1714.
Susannah, of Sus., July 18, 1714.
Mary, of Jan. 21, 1710[1
John, of Jan. 3, 1713[4
Samuel, of Feb. 24, 1716[7
Nathanael, of July 13, 1718.
Mary, of Aug. 13, 1721.
Hannah, of John, May 30, 1731.
John, of „ Apr. 8, 1733.
John, of John and

Eliza, May 23, 1736.

Mills, of „ „ Feb. 26, 1737[8
Thomas, of „ „ Feb. 24, 1739[0
Elizabeth, of John, Aug. 30, 1741.
Rowel, of May 28, 1738.
Elizab., of Hannah, Sept. 30, 1739.

COWPER.

1714[5 Jan. 23 William.

COX(E).

1666 Apr. 29. Robert.
1691 Oct. 4. Elizabeth.
1691 Nov. 1. Mary.
1693 Mar. 19. Martha.
1694 Elizabeth.
1707 Mar. 16. Agnes.
1742 Mary.

Susanna, of Nich., Mar. 26, 1693.
Isaac, of Apr. 23, 1693.
Elias, of Agnes, Apr. 6, 1707.
Andrew, of „ Feb. 13, 1714[5
Mary, of Jonathan, Feb. 28, 1713[4
Mary, of Eliza, Aug. 21, 1726.
William, of „ Nov. 17, 1728.
Elizabeth, of Jan. 25, 1701[2

Joanna, of Jan. 7, 1704[5]
 Ruth, of Nov. 13, 1709.
 Samuel, of Apr. 20, 1712.
 Martha, of Mar. 31, 1717.
 James, of Jan. 19, 1723[4]
 of Jan. 30, 1731[2]
 Elizabeth, of Aug. 10, 1735.

CRABTREE.

1655 Nov. 9 to
 June 3, 1657. S.

CRAFT, or CRUFT(s), or CRUFF.

1772 Jan. 26. Ann.

John of Abigail, Aug. 14, 1720.
 Mary, of .. Jan. 28, 1727[8]
 Elizabeth, of ,, Aug. 1, 1731.
 Foster, of .. June 2, 1734.
 Edward, of Aug. 26, 1716.
 Abigail, of Jan. 28, 1721[2]
 Sarah, of Apr. 11, 1725.
 Mercy, of May 4, 1729.
 Edward, of Aug. 9, 1730.

CREHORE.

1729 June 29. Benjamin.
 1729 June 29. Ruhama.

John, of July 2, 1727.

CRESEY.

1702 June 28. Susanna.

CRITCHET.

1678 June 2. Henry.

CROCKER.

1786 Joseph.
 Prior to 1786. Hannah.

CROSBY.

1792 or 3. Amos.

CROSS.

John, of Sarah, June 26, 1709.
 Elizabeth, of Feb. 18, 1710[1]

CUMBY.

1714 Dec. 26. Bebecka.

Mary, of Robert, Dec. 28, 1690.

CUMMIN(G)s.

Thomas, of Oct. 28, 1694.
 Sarah, of Sept. 20, 1696.

CUNNABEL(L).

Mary, of Jan. 23, 1703[4]

John, of Samuel, May 27, 1711.
 Abigail, of Jan. 4, 1712[3]
 Elizabeth, of Apr. 25, 1714.
 William, of Mar. 18, 1716.
 Samuel, of Mar. 18, 1716.
 Samuel, of Apr. 7, 1717.
 Sarah, of Samuel, Mar. 1, 1719.
 Abigail, of Sept. 23, 1722.
 William, of Mar. 8, 1724.
 John, of Aug. 15, 1725.
 Preserved, of Nov. 5, 1727.
 Hannah, of Oct. 19, 1729.

CURTIS.

1688 June 3. Mary.
 1711 June 3. Mary.

Mary, of Apr. 22, 1694.

CUSHING.

1669 May 16. S.
 1672 Sept. 7. Jeremiah.
 1690 Mar. 2. Thomas.
 1700 July 28. Benjamin.

Elizab., of Thomas, Nov. 8, 1691.
 Thomas, of ,, Feb. 4, 1693[4]
 Margaret, of ,, July 19, 1696.
 Deborah, of ,, June 18, 1699.
 Jonathan, of ,, Mar. 16, 1701.
 Hannah, of ,, Jan. 17, 1702[3]
 Samuel, of ,, Jan. 14, 1704[5]
 Jeremiah, of Judith, Oct. 11, 1696.
 John, of Mar. 19, 1699.
 Benjamin, of Nov. 17, 1700.
 Ebenezer, of May 28, 1704.
 John, of July 8, 1705.
 Ebenezer, of Judith, May 7, 1710.

CUTLER.

William, of Elizab., June 1, 1718.
 Hannah, of Hannah, Apr. 7, 1728.
 Timothy, of Oct. 19, 1735.

CUTTS.

1727[8 Jan. 7. Hannah.

DAFFON.

Henry, of Mary, Jan. 26, 1728[9]

DAGGET.

1717[8 Feb. 23. Lydia.

Lydia, of Lydia, Jan. 31, 1713[4]
 Lydia, of Feb. 5, 1715[6]
 Susannah, of Lydia, Oct. 15, 1721.
 Rebeckah, of ,, Sept. 27, 1719.

DANIEL.

Elizabeth, of Sept. 8, 1706.
 Elizabeth, of Zab., Jan. 23, 1708[9
 Mary, of Zabadiah, Jan. 15, 1709[0
 Nathaniel, of „ Dec. 21, 1712.
 Elizabeth, of „ Oct. 3, 1714.
 John, of „ Jan. 20, 1716[7
 Samuel, of „ Feb. 22, 1718[9
 Joanna, of „ Aug. 6, 1721.

DAVENPORT.

1689[0 Jan. 26. Ann.

Ann, of Ann, Jan. 26, 1689[0
 Abigail, of John
 and Abigail, Feb. 24, 1733[4

DAVIS.

1650 June 5. George.
 1677 Apr. 13. Ann.
 1691 Mar. 15. Elizabeth.
 1786 Nathan.

Hannah, of Eliza, Oct. 23, 1692.
 Sarah, of „ Oct. 23, 1692.
 John, of El., Apr. 23, 1696.
 Elizabeth, of „ Apr. 23, 1696.
 Thomas, of „ Apr. 23, 1696.
 Mary, of „ Apr. 23, 1696.
 John, of Eliza, Aug. 23, 1719.
 Sarah, of Sarah, May 20, 1711.
 James, of Oct. 18, 1713.
 Sarah, of Sept. 13, 1719.
 Thomas, of May 22, 1720.

DAVISON.

1729 June 29. William.

DAWES.

Elizabeth, of Thos., Apr. 19, 1730.

DAWSON, or DOSSON.

1678 Apr. 14. Henry.
 1728[9 Jan. 5. Mary.

Thomas, of Henry, Nov. 22, 1691.
 James, of „ Feb. 9, 1695[6
 Hannah, of „ Mar. 20, 1698.
 Elizabeth, of „ Mar. 31, 1700.
 Mary, of James, Nov. 1, 1719.
 Samuel, of Feb. 16, 1723[4
 Henry, of Apr. 2, 1727.
 Elizabeth, of Mary, Mar. 14, 1731.
 Abigail, of „ Mar. 10, 1734.
 Abigail, of „ Feb. 1, 1735[6

DAY.

1677 Apr. 6. S.
 1694 Sarah.

1696 Oct. 11. Abigail.

DEACON.

1669 Apr. 4. John.

DEAN.

1698 Apr. 3. Jane.
 1779 Dec. 5. Mary.

Mary, of Jane, Apr. 3, 1698.
 Thomas, of „ Apr. 3, 1698.
 Jane, of „ Sept. 4, 1698.

DELA PLACE.

1723 Jan. 12. Eliza.

DEMENEY.

1697 Aug. 22. Sarah.

DENCE.

1679 July 6. S.

DENHAM.

1689 Oct. 27. Ann.

Samuel, of Eliza, Apr. 17, 1692.
 Anna, of „ Sept. 3, 1693.
 Sarah, of „ Oct. 13, 1700.
 Anna, of Ann, Apr. 23, 1699.
 John, of Oct. 17, 1697.
 Ann, of Sept. 20, 1702.
 Joseph, of July 9, 1704.
 Mary, of Oct. 14, 1705.
 of Oct. 21, 1705.
 Bethiah, of Feb. 8, 1707[8

DENNIS.

1728[9 Susanna.

Damaris, of Ebenr., Aug. 2, 1702.
 Susannah, of Oct. 24, 1708.
 Mary, of Susannah, Jan. 21, 1710[1
 Ebenezer, of „ Feb. 21, 1713[4
 Michael, of „ Dec. 11, 1715.

DENISON.

1696 May 10. Mercy.

DERBY.

1689[0 Feb. 23. Sara.

DEXTER.

1659 Nov. 6. S.

DIAMOND.

1725 Apr. 11. Ann.

Thomas, of Ann, Nov. 21, 1708.
 William, of „ Mar. 25, 1711.

Mary, of Mary, Mar. 25, 1711.
John, of Sept. 20, 1713.

DIMMOCK, or DIMMICK.
1725 May 23. Jabez.

Mercy, of Mary, Mar. 15, 1724.
Mary, of Jabez, Jan. 29, 1726[7]

DINSDAIL.
1658 Dec. 26. B.

DIXWELL.
Mary, of John, Dec. 18, 1709.
Elizabeth, of,, Mar. 21, 1714.

DOD.
1655 Nov. 9 to
June 3, 1657. S.

DOLEBERRY.
1691 July to Sept. Elizabeth.
Elizabeth, of July 12, 1691.

DOLBIER, or DOLBEAR.
1700 July 21. Sarah.
John, of Apr. 26, 1702.
Thomas, of Apr. 9, 1704.
Samuel, of May 18, 1707.

DORR.
1680 Nov. 14. Edward.
1681 June 19. S.

DORRINGTON.
1773 Oct. 3. Mary.
William, of May 3, 1724.
Mary, of Aug. 22, 1725.
John, of Jan. 1, 1726[7]
Samuel, of Damaris, May 3, 1730.
Elizabeth, of Apr. 18, 1731.
Stephen, of Damaris, Apr. 8, 1733.
Sarah, of Mar. 30, 1735.
Margaret, of June 20, 1736.
George, of Damaris, Feb. 26, 1737[8]
George, of,, June 10, 1739.

DOUGLAS.
1655 Nov. 9 to
June 3, 1657. B.
1655 Nov. 9 to
June 3, 1657. S.

DOUSE.
Hannah, of Nathl., Oct. 31, 1697.
(of Charlestown.)

DOWDING, or DOWDEN.
1725 Apr. 18. Joseph.

Leonard, of Ann, July 7, 1695.
Ann, of,, Jan. 2, 1697[8]
Joseph, of Joseph, Nov. 24, 1700.
Joseph, of Ann, Nov. 8, 1702.
Sands, of,, Mar. 5, 1704.
Mercy, of,, Feb. 18, 1704[5]
Rebeckah, of,, Sept. 14, 1707.
Elizabeth, of,, Oct. 2, 1709.
Isabellah, of,, Aug. 31, 1712.

Downs.
1667 Aug. 8. S.

DOWRICK.
Mary, of Martha
(Goodwin), May 27, 1733.

DRAPER.
Moses, of Moses
and Mary, Sept. 17, 1693.

DRISCO.
1725 May 23. Elizabeth.

DRUMMOND.
1716 Mar. 11. Mary.

DUMERIT, or DUMERAY, &c.
1690 Mar. 2. Charles.
1718 May 11. Hannah.

John, of Charles, Mar. 16, 1690.
Thomas, of,, Mar. 16, 1690.
Sara, of,, Mar. 16, 1690.
Sara, of,, Dec. 7, 1690.
Mary, of,, Feb. 21, 1691[2]
Benjamin, of,, Apr. 8, 1694.
Martha, of,, June 9, 1695.
Sarah, of,, June 9, 1700.
Samuel, of,, June 28, 1702.
John, of John, Jan. 7, 1710[1]
John, of,, Nov. 16, 1712.
Sarah, of,, May 2, 1714.
Hannah, of Aug. 21, 1715.
Charles, of Dec. 23, 1716.
Thomas, of Sept. 7, 1718.
Thomas, of Sept. 28, 1718.
Thomas, of Aug. 16, 1719.
Charles, of Hannah, Oct. 25, 1719.
Sarah, of Sept. 4, 1720.
Silas, of Nov. 6, 1720.
Sarah, of Dec. 3, 1721.
Silas, of Apr. 29, 1722.
Mary, of Oct. 20, 1723.
Anna, of Nov. 17, 1723.
Thomas, of Nov. 15, 1724.

John, of Feb. 27, 1725[6]
 Ebenezer, of July 23, 1727.
 of July 30, 1727.
 Thomas, of John, July 13, 1729.
 Hannah, of ,, Oct. 25, 1730.
 John, of ,, May 25, 1735.
 Ebenezer, of ,, May 22, 1737.
 Mary, of ,, Mar. 30, 1740.
 Hannah, of Apr. 23, 1732.
 Elizab., of Hannah, Aug. 12, 1733.
 Ezekiel, of Abigail, Sept. 4, 1737.

DUN.

Nathl., of Nicholas, May 13, 1711.
 Anna, of ,, Dec. 28, 1712.
 Samuel, of Nov. 28, 1714.

DUNBAR.

1723 Aug. 4. Samuel.

DUPEE.

Prior to 1786. Elias.

DURGEE.

1720 June 12. Abigail.

Abigail, of June 19, 1720.
 Samuel, of July 30, 1721.
 Abigail, of Abigail, Feb. 23, 1723[4]
 Mary, of July 31, 1726.
 Andrew, of Jan. 26, 1728[9]

DUTSON.

1694 June 10. Mary.

DYER, or DYAR, or DIER.

1691 July to Sept. Samuel.
 1693 June 10. Henry (bapt.).

Samuel, of July 12, 1691.
 Lydia, of Samuel, July 26, 1691.
 Elizabeth, of ,, Nov. 15, 1691.
 Samuel, of ,, May 26, 1695.
 William, of ,, Dec. 6, 1696.
 Mary, of ,, May 7, 1699.
 Barrett, of Barrett, Oct. 24, 1703.
 Nathaniel, of Jane, July 24, 1715.
 William, of June 2, 1717.

D—.

1721 Apr. 9. Sarah.

EARL.

1694 Sept. 30. Robert.
 1694 Sept. 30. Roger.
 1699 Sept. 3. Mary.
 1727 Dec. 24. Abigail.

Robert, of June 25, 1693.

Roger, of June 25, 1693.

John, of Robert and

Sarah, Aug. 22, 1697.
 Richard, of Roger, Feb. 5, 1698[9]
 Ann, of ,, Aug. 23, 1702.
 Robert, of ,, Feb. 4, 1704[5]
 Mary, of Mary, Oct. 8, 1699.
 Sarah, of ,, Sept. 18, 1720.
 Martha, of ,, Feb. 4, 1732[3]
 Mary, of ,, Dec. 1, 1734.
 Ann, of ,, Jan. 29, 1737[8]
 Robert, of ,, Feb. 3, 1739[0]
 Lydia, of Apr. 13, 1701.
 Samuel, of Mar. 12, 1704.
 Mary, of Sept. 9, 1705.
 Robert, of Oct. 20, 1723.
 Abigail, of Feb. 13, 1725[6]
 Sarah, of July 7, 1728.
 John, of Mar. 28, 1731.

EATON.

1739 Dec. 30. Sarah.

E(A)YRES.

1677 Mar. 23. S.
 1684[5 Jan. 18. Nathaniel.

E(E)DES.

Elizabeth, of Eliz., Apr. 9, 1693.
 Edward, of Edward, June 10, 1705.
 John, of Nov. 9, 1707.
 Jonathan, of Aug. 7, 1709.
 Martha, of May 27, 1711.
 Jonathan, of Feb. 20, 1714[5]

EDMONDS.

Prior to 1786, Joseph.

EDWARDS.

1677[8 Feb. 17. Mary.

Daniel, of Martha, June 20, 1703.
 Thomas, of ,, June 20, 1703.
 John, of Oct. 17, 1703.
 John, of Feb. 18, 1704[5]
 Katharine, of Kath., Sept. 1, 1706.
 Sarah, of ,, Aug. 3, 1707.
 Samuel, of ,, July 24, 1709.
 Hannah, of Benj., June 29, 1712.
 Benjamin, of ,, June 16, 1717.

ELDRIDGE.

1693 May or June, Hannah.

ELI.

1672 Oct. 20. B.
 1672[3 Feb. 12. S.

ELICUT.
Vynes,* Sept. 26, 1697.

ELLET.
1714[5 Jan. 16. S. Marra.

John, of Maria, Mar. 20, 1715.
Bartholomew, of,, June 3, 1716.
Maria, of,, May 11, 1718.
John, of,, June 11, 1721.

ELLIOT.
1732 Dec. 10. Martha.

Ann, of Theodosia, Sept. 23, 1711.
Clark, of Martha, Dec. 31, 1732.

ELLIS.
1689[0 Feb. 23. Mary.

James, } twins of Nov. 15, 1713.
Susanh., }

EMMS, or EM(M)ES.
1673 Dec. 6. Henry.
1708 Mar. 21. Hephshibah.
1718 Oct. 5. Sarah.
1782 Nathaniel.

Nathaniel, of Henry, Oct. 12, 1690.
Elizabeth, of Apr. 7, 1695.
Samuel, of Bethia, Mar. 28, 1697.
Robert, of,, Mar. 28, 1697.
Robert, of Apr. 11, 1697.
Benjamin, of Apr. 2, 1699.
Jacob, of Mary, June 22, 1701.
Saml., of Hephsebah, July 5, 1713.
Hephshibah, of,, June 5, 1715.
Mary, of,, June 2, 1717.
Elizabeth, of,, Jan. 29, 1720[1
Henry, of Dec. 28, 1718.

EMUNDS.
1699 Nov. 19. Elizabeth.

ENDICOT.
Benjamin, of Hanna, June 28, 1691.
John, of Mary Feb. 19, 1692[3
Bayworth, of,, Apr. 7, 1695.

ENGLISH.
1667 Aug. 8. S.
1688 July 6. James.
1690 May 4. Elizabeth.
1690 May 25. Mary.

1769 Oct. 29. Mary.

Elizabeth, of Love, Feb. 2, 1700[1
William, of,, Feb. 7, 1702[3

EUSTACE(TIS).
1689 Mar. 24. Joseph.
1707 June 22. Rachel.
1715 May 1. Benjamin.
1715 May 1. Katharin.
1720[1 Jan. 15. William.
1720[1 Jan. 15. Sarah.
1728 Mar. 10. Joseph.

Rachel, of R., Apr. 13, 1701.
David, of,, Apr. 13, 1701.
Elizabeth, of,, Apr. 13, 1701.
Mary, of,, Apr. 13, 1701.
Joshua, of Feb. 14, 1702[3
Samuel, of Apr. 29, 1705.
Elizabeth, of May 19, 1706.
Jonathan, of Sarah, June 23, 1706.
Sarah, of,, June 23, 1706.
Mary, of,, June 23, 1706.
Susannah, of Feb. 2, 1706[7
Hannah, of Apr. 13, 1707.
James, of Apr. 10, 1709.
Abigail, of May 6, 1711.
John, of Apr. 5, 1713.
Joseph, of William, Nov. 1, 1713.
Thomas, of,, Nov. 1, 1713.
Nathaniel, of,, Nov. 1, 1713.
Samuel, of,, Nov. 1, 1713.
Benjamin, of Benj. Dec. 26, 1714.
George, of Apr. 27, 1718.
Joshua, of June 22, 1718.
Elizabeth, of Nov. 8, 1719.
Benjamin, of Apr. 17, 1720.
Jacob, of July 29, 1722.
Katharine, of June 30, 1723.
Joseph, posth. of
David, Sept. 13, 1730.

EVANS.
Jona., of Jonathan, Apr. 7, 1695.
Elizabeth, of Oct. 4, 1696.
Robert, of June 18, 1699.
Bathsheba, of Mar. 9, 1701.
David, of Sept. 29, 1706.
Joseph, of Aug. 28, 1709.

EVERTON, or EVERDIN.
Elizabeth, of Feb. 11, 1693[4
Joanna, of Dec. 15, 1695.

EWIN.
Michael, of Ed., Jan. 8, 1709[0
Elizabeth, of,, Jan. 8, 1709[0

* A youth, about twelve years of age, presented by a woman of the Old Church (one Cable, who had brought him up) in their knowledge, and for the service of Christ; and promised still to do so.

FAIRWEATHER.

Jerusha, of Jerusha, Aug. 26, 1711.
 Eliza, of „ June 21, 1713.
 John, of „ July 31, 1715.
 John, of Sept. 30, 1716.
 Mary, of Jan. 12, 1717[8
 Elizabeth, of Mar. 22, 1719.

FARMER.

1734 May 26. Mary.
 1771 Jan. 27. John.

Thomas, of Oct. 10, 1714.
 Paul, of Apr. 22, 1716.
 Elizabeth, of Apr. 20, 1718.
 Ann, of July 19, 1719.
 John, of Oct. 2, 1720.
 Mary, of Mary, Dec. 8, 1734.

FARNHAM, or FARNHUM.

1650 June 5. John.
 1658[9 Jan. 16. S.
 1688 Apr. 15. Martha.
 1689 Apr. 7. Dorothy.
 1693 Sept. 24. Jonathan (bapt).
 1769 Ann.

John, of Dorothy, Dec. 14, 1690.
 Mary, of „ Oct. 23, 1692.
 Elizabeth, of Martha, Oct. 19, 1691.
 Joseph, of Jonathan, Oct. 22, 1693.
 Martha, of Jonathan
 and Martha, Mar. 29, 1696.
 Dorothy, of David, Oct. 4, 1696.
 Elizab., of Jonathan, Apr. 2, 1699.
 Jonathan, of „ July 10, 1709.
 Susannah, of June 17, 1711.
 John, of Sept. 20, 1713.
 John, of Jan. 1, 1715[6

FATOR.

John, of Sarah, Aug. 9, 1724.

FAUK(E)s.

1704 Aug. 6. Thomas.

Sarah, of Thomas
 and Sarah, Apr. 17, 1709.
 John, of Aug. 12, 1711.

FAXON.

1695[6 Jan. 26. Abigail.

F(E)ATHERGIL(L), or FOTHERGIL(L).
 Eliza, of Robert, Feb. 5, 1709[0
 Mary, of Dec. 6, 1713.
 Robert, of Robert, June 16, 1717.
 Sarah, of Apr. 26, 1724.
 Joseph, of July 18, 1725.

Mary, of Robert, Dec. 25, 1726.
 Susanna, of „ Nov. 17, 1728.
 Abigail, of Sept. 6, 1730.
 Abigail, of Robert, Sept. 26, 1731.
 Richard, of „ May 4, 1735.

FENNECY.

Prior to 1786. Elizabeth.

FENNO.

1771 May Elizabeth.

FEVERYEAR(E), or FEVRIERE.

1708[9 Feb. 13. Grafton.
 1718 Mar. 16. Joanna.
 1728 May 5. Sarah.

Grafton, of Grafton

and Sarah, Aug. 4, 1728.
 Thomas, of „ „ Aug. 31, 1729.
 John, of „ „ Apr. 4, 1731.
 Grafton, of „ „ Sept. 3, 1732.
 Sarah, of „ „ Aug. 18, 1734.
 Joseph, of „ „ June 20, 1736.
 Mary, of „ „ May 21, 1738.
 Mehetabel, of Dea.
 Grafton, Mar. 2, 1740.

FITCH.

Benjamin, of Mary, Jan. 21, 1693[4
 Eliphalet, of Nov. 3, 1695.
 Mary, of May 29, 1698.

FLACK.

Mary, of Mary, Mar. 4, 1694.
 John, of May 31, 1696.
 Samuel, of Mar. 13, 1698.
 John, of Mar. 17, 1700.
 Solomon, of John, May 24, 1702.

FLAG(G), &c.

Mary, of Thomas, Mar. 2, 1707.
 William, of Nov. 28, 1708.
 Esther, of Mar. 18, 1711.
 Hannah, of Dec. 7, 1712.
 Thomas, of Thomas, July 3, 1715.
 Joseph, of Aug. 4, 1717.
 John, of Sept. 7, 1718.
 Mary, of May 8, 1720.

FLEMING.

Elizabeth, of Eliza, Mar. 4, 1716.
 Elizabeth, of July 13, 1718.
 Thomas, of Mar. 13, 1720.

FLETCHER.

1722 Apr. 1. William.
 1722 Apr. 1. Margery.

James, of Apr. 26, 1719.
Nathaniel, of Oct. 23, 1720.
Philippa, of Sept. 27, 1724.

FRIER, or FRYER.

1655 Nov. 9 to
June 3, 1657. S.
1659 Mar. 13. Nathaniel.

Elizabeth, of Eliza, Sept. 14, 1735.

FRIZZEL.

1709 Mar. 21. John.

FROST.

1711 June 3. Ann.

FROTHINGHAM.

1707 Nov. 9. Esther.
(Wife of William.)

1710 June 25. Anna.
(Wife of John.)

Peter, of Esther, Dec. 1, 1695.
Esther, of „ Dec. 1, 1695.
Mary, of „ Dec. 5, 1697.
William, of „ July 27, 1707.
Richard, of „ June 18, 1710.
Richard, of „ Apr. 17, 1715.

FULLER.

1681 Mar. 1. Ann.

FULWOOD.

1677 Apr. or May. S.

FYFIELD, or FIEFIELD.

1710 Oct. 1. Giles.

Hannah, of David, Nov. 1, 1719.

GAGE.

1696 May 10. Agnes.

GALLANT.

1699 Nov. 19. Hannah.

Hannah, of Sept. 13, 1702.

GALLOP.

1662[3 Feb. 22. Mary.

GAMAL.

William, of May 24, 1724.
John, of Dec. 12, 1725.
Elizabeth, of Sept. 8, 1728.

GARDNER.

1691 June or July. Samuel.

1747 Joseph,
(From Newport.)

1768 Susannah.
1792 or 3 Linuel.
1792 James.

Elizabeth, of Samuel, Feb. 9, 1695[6
Mary, of „ Dec. 18, 1698.
Mary, of „ July 21, 1700.
Samuel, of „ Dec. 21, 1701.
John, of „ Apr. 11, 1703.
John, of „ June 4, 1704.
William, of „ June 15, 1707.
Sarah, of „ May 29, 1709.
Ruth, of „ Dec. 17, 1710.
Susannah, of „ Mar. 9, 1712.
Joseph, of „ May 10, 1713.
Joseph, of „ Aug. 1, 1714.

GARNOCK.

Eben., of Duncan, Apr. 17, 1692.
Thomas, of Jan. 26, 1695[6

GEE.

1680 S.
1697 May 2. Joshua.
1697 May 2. Eliza.
1706 Apr. 14. John.
1709 May 22. Elizabeth.
1716 May 13. Joshua.
1725 Apr. 11. Sarah.
1740 Apr. 20. Sarah.
1799 Lydia.

Peter, of Mar. 30, 1690.
Ann, of May 1, 1692.
Samuel, of Joshua, June 13, 1697.
Joshua, of „ July 3, 1698.
John, of „ Mar. 3, 1700.
Ebenezer, of „ Dec. 27, 1702.
Elizabeth, of „ June 18, 1704.
John, of Elizabeth, Mar. 23, 1707.
Peter, of Dec. 12, 1708.
Elizabeth, of Jan. 22, 1709[0
Ann, of Mar. 9, 1712.
Mary, of John, May 31, 1713.
Mary (the minister's
child), May 24, 1724.

Joshua, „ „ June 6, 1725.
Sarah, „ „ Sept. 4, 1726.
Elizabeth, „ „ Oct. 1, 1727.
Margaret, „ „ May 4, 1729.
Anna, „ „ Jan. 5, 1734[5
John, „ „ Aug. 22, 1736.
Susannah, „ „ Nov. 23, 1740.

GENDAL.

John, of Jan. 5, 1723[4
Joseph, of Dec. 12, 1725.

GEORGE.

1690	May 4.	Mary.
1725	May 2.	Sarah.
1731	Oct. 31.	Nicholas.
<hr/>		
Abigail, of Mary,	Feb. 16,	1717[5
Thomas, of	Sept. 6,	1719.
Mary, of	Feb. 14,	1719[0
Nicholas, of	Jan. 13,	1722[3
Elizabeth, of	May 23,	1725.
Joshua, of	Aug. 23,	1728.
Sarah, of Elizabeth,	July 4,	1731.

GER(R)ISH.

1697	Apr. 25.	Lydia.
1734	Apr. 29.	John.

Elizabeth, of Lydia,	Nov. 5,	1693.
John, of	Jan. 26,	1695[6
William, of	Jan. 2,	1697[8
Mary, of Mary,	Sept. 5,	1736.
George, of	May 13,	1739.
Elizabeth, of Mary,	Aug. 10,	1740.

GIBSON or GYPSON.

1650	June 5.	Christopher.
1662	July 5.	S.
1695	July 28.	Benjamin.

Sarah, of Mercy,	Sept. 12,	1697.
Rebeckah, of Sarah,	Sept. 1,	1700.
Benjamin, of Benj.,	Nov. 10,	1700.
William, of	Apr. 12,	1702.
James, of	June 25,	1704.
Mehetabel, of	Aug. 11,	1706.
Samuel, of	Nov. 4,	1711.
Mary, of	Jan. 30,	1703[4
Hannah, of	Mar. 27,	1709.
William, of Sarah,	Apr. 15,	1733.

GILBERT.

1692	Mar. 20.	Lydia.
------	----------	--------

Anna, of Lydia,	June 12,	1692.
Lydia, of	Aug. 20,	1693.
Mary, of	May 26,	1695.
Thomas, of	Aug. 29,	1697.
Samuel, of Lydia,	Feb. 26,	1698[9
Elizabeth, of	Feb. 7,	1702[3
Anna, of	July 13,	1707.

GILL.

1678	June 2.	Obadiah.
1710	Aug. 13.	Elizabeth.
1719	Aug. 2.	Elizabeth.

Nathaniel, of	Feb. 16,	1689[0
Sara, of Obadiah and		
Elizabeth, Jan.	4,	1690[1

Mehetabel, of Obad.

and Elizabeth,	Jan. 6,	1694[5
Elizabeth, of El.,	June 17,	1694.
William, of	Apr. 7,	1695.
John, of	Oct. 3,	1697.
Releef, of Releef,	Nov. 14,	1697.
(of Charlestown.)		
Scarlet, of	Apr. 14,	1700.
Obadiah, of	Mar. 8,	1702.
Sarah, of Sarah,	Nov. 8,	1702.
Katharine, of	Feb. 13,	1703[4
Mary, of	May 6,	1705.
Samuel, of	Aug. 17,	1707.
Jane, of	Nov. 25,	1711.

GLIDDEN.

Joseph, of Jane,	Apr. 13,	1791.
------------------	----------	-------

GOFF(E).

1676[7	Jan. 16.	John
1697	Aug. 22.	Hanna.
1706	June 9.	John.
1709[0	Jan. 22.	Hannah.
1727	Dec. 24.	Samuel.
1728	Mar. 10.	William.

Hannah, of John,	Aug. 2, 1691.
Ebenezer, of „	Feb. 12, 1692[3
Elizabeth, of „	May 5, 1695.
Sarah, of „	Dec. 13, 1696.
Sarah, of „	June 11, 1699.
Sarah, of „	Aug. 21, 1709.
Mary, of „	Apr. 15, 1711.
John, of „	Mar. 23, 1701.
Daniel, { of A. }	June 13, 1703.
Rachel, { Wentworth, }	
Hannah, of „	Feb. 10, 1705[6
Elizabeth, of „	Aug. 15, 1708.
Mary, of „	Mar. 19, 1710.
Mercy, of „	June 29, 1712.
Joseph, of „	Aug. 24, 1712.
Hannah, of „	May 23, 1714.
William, of William,	July 31, 1715.
Joseph, of „	Apr. 1, 1716.
Abigail, of „	June 2, 1717.
William, of „	Mar. 8, 1719.
Ebenezer, of „	Mar. 5, 1721.
Rebeckah, of „	Mar. 3, 1723.
Abigail, of „	May 29, 1726.
Hannah, of William,	Apr. 11, 1725.
Rebecca, of „	May 2, 1731.
Martha, of „	Apr. 1, 1733.
Nathaniel, of „	Mar. 20, 1737.
Ebenezer, of Samuel	
and Sarah,	Apr. 21, 1728.
Abigail, of „ „	Jan. 25, 1729[0
Ebenezer, of Samuel,	Nov. 7, 1731.

Abigail, of Samuel
and Sarah, Apr. 15, 1733.
Mary, of Samuel, Nov. 9, 1735.

Go(u)LD.

1709[0 Jan. 22. Experience.

Thomas, of Expe-
rience, Mar. 8, 1696.
Elizabeth, of „ Mar. 8, 1696.
Bartholomew, of „ Apr. 5, 1696.
Bartholomew, of May 22, 1698.
Hannah, of Nov. 17, 1700.
Sarah, of May 25, 1712.
Benjamin, of Sarah, July 4, 1736.

GOLDSMITH.

1715 Mar. 13. John.

Mercy, of Jan. 16, 1725[6
Mary, of Dec. 31, 1727.
John, of John, June 1, 1729.

GOLDTHWAIT.

1705[6 Feb. 3. John.

Sarah, of Dec. 21, 1701.
John, of May 30, 1703.
Benjamin, of Nov. 26, 1704.
Joseph, of Oct. 13, 1706.
Sarah, of Sept. 19, 1708.
Ezekiel, of July 23, 1710.
Margaret, of John, Dec. 16, 1711.
Margaret, of May 9, 1714.
Eliza, of John, Nov. 6, 1715.
Thomas, of Jan. 19, 1719[8
Hannah, of Dec. 27, 1719.
Jane, of John, Nov. 20, 1720.
Hannah, of „ Aug. 5, 1722.
Mary, of „ Apr. 12, 1724.

GOODRIDGE.

Prior to 1786. Sarah.

Anna, of Anna, Mar. 27, 1698.
Elizabeth, of „ July 30, 1699.
Walter, of „ July 13, 1701.
Elizabeth, of „ July 18, 1703.
Thomas, of Nov. 24, 1706.
Mary, of Nov. 2, 1707.
Katharine, of Ann, Mar. 23, 1712.

GOODWELL(WILL).

1691 Oct. 4. Mary.
1718 Apr. 13. Thomas.

George, of Mary, Oct. 12, 1691.
Thomas, of „ Oct. 12, 1691.

Lydia, of Thomas, Nov. 1, 1724.
Elizabeth, of „ Oct. 23, 1726.

GOODWIN(XN)(ING).

1690 May 25. John.
1690 May 25. Martha.
1690[1 Feb. 21. Martha.
1697]8 Feb. 6. John.
1701 May 11. Elizabeth.
1702 May 7. Nathanael.
1708 Mar. 28. Benjamin.
1709 Mar. 21. Hannah.
1716 Mar. 28. Frances.
1727 Nov. 12. Martha.
1744 Mercy.

Mercy, of John, Mar. 2, 1690.
Elizabeth, of John
and Mary, Sept. 9, 1694.
Nathaniel, of Eliza., Nov. 29, 1696.
John, of July 16, 1699.
Elizabeth, of Jan. 19, 1700[1
John, of John, Feb. 9, 1700[1
Mary, of „ Apr. 26, 1702.
Martha, of „ Dec. 19, 1703.
Margaret, of „ Feb. 11, 1704[5
Abiel, of „ Feb. 22, 1707[8
Thomas, of Natha-
niel, July 8, 1705.
Mary, of Dec. 20, 1719.
William, of May 21, 1721.
Thomas, of May 27, 1722.
Abigail, of Nov. 28, 1725.
James, of Mary, Jan. 29, 1726[7
Abigail, of Thomas, Sept. 6, 1730.
Abigail, of „ Dec. 26, 1731.
Thomas, of „ Oct. 28, 1733.
Rebecca, of July 28, 1734.
Rebecca, of Rebec-
cah, Sept. 1, 1734.
Roope, of Abigail, Dec. 24, 1738.

GRANT.

1688[9 Feb. 24. Joanna.
1691 June or July. Hanna.
1696 Aug. 23. James.
1719 Oct. 25. Dorothy.
1725 June 27. Joseph.
1727[8 Jan. 7. Joseph.
1742 Edward.

James, of Joanna, Apr. 7, 1690.
Joanna, of „ July 22, 1694.
Joseph, of Hanna, June 28, 1691.
John, of Sept. 24, 1693.
of Jan. 16, 1697[8
Samuel, of Oct. 14, 1705.
Judah, of July 17, 1709.

Joseph, of	June 10, 1716.
Edward, of	Dec. 13, 1719.
John, of	Sept. 2, 1722.
William, of	Apr. 7, 1728.

GRAY.

1701	July 27.	Thomas.
1705	Dec. 23.	Susanna.

GRECIAN.

Ann, of Ann,	Mar. 8, 1719.
--------------	---------------

GREELY.

1781	Dec. 2.	Mary.
------	---------	-------

GREEN.

1665	May 14.	Rebeccah.
1666	Sept. 30.	S.
		(Wife of Henry ?)
1681[2		James.
1682	25.	Eliza.
1682	Oct. 29.	John.
1682	Oct. 29.	Anna.
1693	Nov. 12.	Anna.
1696	Oct. 11.	Joseph.
1700	Mar. 10.	Timothy.
1707	June 22.	Mary.
1722	Dec. 22.	Joseph.

Solomon, of John and Hannah,	Nov. 16, 1690.
James, of John,	July 30, 1693.
Mary, of Bethiah,	Mar. 21, 1697.
Bethiah, of "	July 27, 1707.
Barthol., of Mariah,	July 18, 1697.
Mather, of Marra,	Jan. 29, 1698[9
James, of	June 13, 1697.
John, of	Nov. 26, 1699.
Thomas, of	July 30, 1704.
Mary, of Joseph,	May 7, 1699.
Joseph, of "	June 22, 1701.
Sarah, of "	July 2, 1704.
Sarah, of "	Apr. 6, 1707.
Joanna, of "	Oct. 16, 1709.
Lydia, of "	Apr. 12, 1713.
Elizabeth, of "	May 8, 1715.
Jonas, of "	Mar. 1, 1719.
Timo., of Timothy,	Dec. 12, 1703.
Samuel, of "	Apr. 21, 1796.
John, of "	July 25, 1708.
Nathanael, of "	Apr. 2, 1710.
Jonas, of "	Dec. 28, 1712.
Elizabeth, of Saml.,	Dec. 31, 1704.
John, of "	Dec. 31, 1710.
Ann, of Abigail (Stacy),	Jan. 17, 1730[1
Richard, of "	Apr. 29, 1733.
James, of "	Mar. 9, 1735.

GREENLEAF.

1715	Oct. 30.	Eliza.
Bickford, of	Feb. 17, 1705[6	
Elizabeth, of	June 27, 1708.	
Mercy, of	Sept. 2, 1711.	
Simon, of	Jan. 22, 1715[6	
Sarah, of	Aug. 8, 1725.	
Judith, of	Mar. 9, 1729.	
Mercy, of Judith,	May 3, 1730.	
David, of "	Nov. 14, 1731.	
Thomas, of "	Sept. 23, 1733.	
Sarah, of "	Aug. 3, 1735.	
Thomas, of "	May 29, 1737.	

GREENOUGH.

1655	Nov. 9 to June 3, 1657.	S.
1657	Jan. 3.	William.
1665	Jan. 14.	S.
1672	Sept. 7.	William.
1682	25.	Eliza.
1690	Apr. 7.	Sara.
1690[1	Feb. 21.	Mercy.
1691	Apr. 19.	Abigail.
1724	Apr. 12.	Elizabeth.
1729	July 27.	Ransford.
1778	Feb. 1.	William.
1780	May	John.
1780	May	Mehitable.
Prior to 1786.		Hannah.
Elizabeth, of John,	Nov. 25, 1694.	
Mary, of "	Aug. 16, 1696.	
William, of "	May 29, 1698.	
John, of "	July 23, 1699.	
William, of "	July 13, 1701.	
Elizabeth, of "	July 11, 1703.	
Abigail, of "	Aug. 26, 1705.	
Newman, of "	May 9, 1708.	
Thomas, of "	May 7, 1710.	
Jerusha, of "	Dec. 30, 1711.	
Samuel, of "	June 27, 1714.	
Samuel, of Eliza,	Sept. 7, 1735.	
Mary, of Ransford,	Nov. 14, 1736.	
Huldah, of Sarah,	June 5, 1737.	
Daniel, of John,	July 16, 1738.	
Huldah, of "	Sept. 30, 1739.	

GREENWOOD.

1662[3	Jan. 11.	Eliza.
1710	Aug. 13.	Samuel.
1710	Aug. 13.	Elizabeth.
1712	Oct. 26.	Samuel.
1722	Dec. 22.	Isaac.
Elizabeth, of	Apr. 24, 1698.	
Nathanael, of	Oct. 15, 1699.	
Anna, of	Apr. 7, 1700.	

Isaac, of May 17, 1702.
 Nathaniel, of Mar. 23, 1707.
 Joseph, of Samuel
 and Eliza, Aug. 20, 1710.
 Ralph, of Phillippa, Feb. 3, 1711[2
 Samuel, of " Feb. 3, 1711[2
 Mary, of Feb. 6, 1714[5
 Samuel, of Samuel, May 22, 1720.
 Benjamin, of " June 3, 1722.
 John, of " Dec. 10, 1727.
 Mary, " May 2, 1731.
 Elizabeth, of " Dec. 24, 1732.
 William, of " July 30, 1738.
 Hannah, of " Oct. 5, 1740.
 Eliza, of Eliza, Aug. 8, 1725.
 Anna, of " Sept. 18, 1726.
 Nathaniel, of " June 29, 1729.
 Nathaniel, of " July 18, 1731.
 Nathan., of Nathan-
 iel and Eliza, Sept. 3, 1732.
 Elizabeth, of " Oct. 24, 1731.
 Miles, of " Jan. 2, 1736[7
 John Ventiman, of
 Nathan. and Mary, Mar. 11, 1739.
 Samuel, of Eliza, Sept. 13, 1741.

GRIEBBLE.

1715 May 1. Susanna.

GROCE, or GROSS.

1693 Mar. 19. Maria Katha-
 rina.

Ebenezer, of Abigail, Jan. 8, 1737[8
 Joseph, of " Dec. 23, 1739.
 Phillip, of " Mar. 15, 1741.

GROVER.

1670 June 4. B.

Hannah, of Martha, Apr. 20, 1712.
 Dean, of Feb. 13, 1714[5

GULL.

William, of Jan. 19, 1695[6

GUNNISON, or GUNNESTON.

Samuel, of Lydia, July 29, 1716.
 Joseph, of Feb. 9, 1717[8

(GUNTER.)

Sarah, of Sarah Clark, Aug. 25, 1734.

G(V)ORDEN, or G(V)ORDING.

1681[2 Eliza.
 1691 June 7. Abraham.
 John, of Abigail, Oct. 15, 1693.

Abigail, of Abigail, Aug. 23, 1696.
 Elizabeth, of Sarah, Mar. 5, 1699.

GUTHRY.

David, of Samuel, Dec. 31, 1721.

GUTTRIDGE.

1673 Nov. 2. S.

GYLES.

Hannah, of Martha, Mar. 21, 1714.
 Martha, of " Mar. 21, 1714.
 William, of Mary, Aug. 20, 1721.
 Elizabeth, of " Nov. 27, 1724.
 Mary, of Mar. 31, 1723.

HALL.

1691 Mar. 29. Nathanael.
 1691 Mar. 29. Ann.
 1694 Mary.

Elizabeth, of Mary, Dec. 6, 1702.
 Jonathan, of " Dec. 6, 1702.

HALSEY.

1687[8 Jan. 1. James.
 1694 Mar. 11. Priscilla.
 1705[6 Feb. 3. Jane.
 1728[9 Jan. 12. Abigail.

James, of Hannah, Feb. 23, 1700[1
 Mary, of " Feb. 23, 1700[1
 Hannah, of " Feb. 23, 1700[1
 Jane, of Jane, Mar. 15, 1702.
 Mary, of " Dec. 31, 1704.
 Elizabeth, of July 27, 1701.
 Elizabeth, of July 18, 1703.
 Abigail, of Nov. 10, 1706.
 Joseph, of Aug. 24, 1707.
 Joseph, of Sept. 11, 1709.
 Nathaniel, of July 13, 1712.
 Anna, of James, Nov. 15, 1719.

HAMLIN.

1667 Aug. 8. S.

HANCOCK.

Susannah, of Tho., Aug. 26, 1716.

HANNAH, or HANNAN.

1696[7 Feb. 14. Martha.
 1700 May 26. William.

Martha, of Martha, Mar. 6, 1697.
 of Jan. 15, 1698[9
 William, of Sept. 15, 1700.
 Elizabeth, of May 16, 1703.

Mary, of William, May 3, 1702.
 William, of „ Oct. 24, 1703.
 George, of „ May 19, 1706.
 Elizabeth, of „ July 18, 1708.

HARATT, or HARRET(T).

Sarah, of Peter, Aug. 7, 1726.
 Mary, of „ Nov. 5, 1727.
 Peter, of „ Jan. 17, 1730[1
 Katha., of „ July 1, 1733.
 Katha., of „ Jan. 12, 1734[5

HARLEY, or HORLEY.

Eleanor, of Eleanor, Aug. 17, 1712.
 Robert, of „ Aug. 28, 1715.
 Martha, of Jan. 23, 1725[6
 Martha, of Martha, May 29, 1726.
 Mary, of „ May 29, 1726.
 Joseph, of Joseph
 and Martha, Sept. 1, 1728.
 Elizabeth, of „ „ Sept. 13, 1730.

HARDEN.

Mary, of Mary, May 4, 1729.
 Samuel, of „ Sept. 26, 1731.

HARRIS.

1681 Sept. 18. Hannah.
 1682 Oct. 29. Thomas.
 1697 Apr. 11. Thomasin.
 1718 Dec. 28. Abigail.
 1785 Mar. 20. Abigail.
 John, of Sarah, Aug. 20, 1704.
 Mary, of „ (?) Mar. 31, 1706.
 Eliza, of Sept. 7, 1707.
 Sarah, of Sept. 24, 1710.
 Samuel, of Dec. 21, 1712.
 Abigail, of Abigail, July 5, 1713.
 Mary, of Feb. 27, 1714[5
 Hannah, of Saml.(?) Oct. 10, 1714.
 Lea[c]h, of „ (?) Feb. 17, 1716[7
 Ambrose, of Aug. 5, 1716.
 [Roup] (?), of July 13, 1718.
 Mercy, of Sept. 6, 1719.

HARRISON.

Erasmus, of Mary, Oct. 25, 1696.
 William, of Mar. 13, 1698.

HAR(R)OD.

1689 Apr. 7. Susanna.
 1711[2 Feb. 24. John.
 1715 July 10. Mary.

Mehetabel, of Apr. 27, 1707.
 Snell, of Mehet., Aug. 21, 1709.
 John, of Mar. 15, 1713.

Benjamin, of Jan. 16, 1714[5
 Snell, of May 20, 1716.
 Mary, of June 9, 1717.
 Susannah, of May 4, 1718.
 Hannah, of May 1, 1720.

HART.

1717 June 9. Michael.
 1719 Nov. 1. Lydia.
 1721 June 4. Elias.
 1733 Dec. 20. Ralph.
 1734[5 Jan. 5. Lois.
 1772 Sept. 20. Elizabeth.

Lydia, of Lydia, Nov. 8, 1719.
 Zephaniah, of Ralph, Dec. 3, 1724.
 Mary, of „ Aug. 7, 1726.
 Abigail, of „ Dec. 10, 1727.
 Rebeckah, of „ Apr. 27, 1729.
 Samuel, of „ Dec. 20, 1730.

HASSEY.

1701 May 11. Martha.
 1703 Oct. 17. William.
 1714 Oct. 10. Asa.

Judith, of William, Dec. 8, 1689.
 Nathanael, of „ Apr. 24, 1692.
 William, of „ Oct. 24, 1703.
 John, of „ July 23, 1710.
 Abiel, of Oct. 20, 1695.
 Nathanael, of Oct. 21, 1705.
 Jacob, of Aug. 28, 1709.
 Jacob, of July 6, 1712.
 Samuel, of Sept. 27, 1713.
 Hannah, of Oct. 21, 1716.
 Sarah, of Jacob, Nov. 3, 1706.
 Jacob, of „ May 9, 1708.

HAYWARD.

1677 Apr. 20. S. Silence.
 1689 Mar. 10. Margarit.

HELY, or HALY.

1709 Mar. 21. Rebecka.
 1712 June 29. Sarah.

Martha, of Martha, June 22, 1690.
 Mary, of Mary, June 7, 1696.
 Sarah, of „ June 7, 1696.
 William, of „ July 5, 1696.
 Mary, of May 30, 1708.
 Katharine, of Feb. 4, 1710[1
 Katharine, of Feb. 15, 1712[3
 Samuel, of Sept. 11, 1715.

HEL(L)YER, or HILLIER.

1709 May 22. John.

1740 Nov. 30. Jonathan.
 1741 July 19. Experience.
 Elizabeth, of Eliza, Mar. 29, 1713.
 John, of John, Dec. 12, 1714.
 Experience, of Dec. 30, 1716.
 Jonathan, of Apr. 26, 1719.
 Samuel, of Aug. 26, 1722.
 Elizabeth, of John, Oct. 11, 1724.
 Thomas, of Oct. 16, 1726.
 Sarah, of Sarah, Nov. 20, 1726.
 Elizabeth, of ,, Nov. 24, 1728.
 Mary, of ,, Jan. 10, 1730[1
 of John, Mar. 30, 1729.

HENCHMAN.

1690 Apr. 14. Abigail.
 1694[5 Feb. 17. Richard.
 1700 June 16. Esther.
 1710 Apr. 23. Dorothy.
 Samuel, of Abigail, Feb. 7, 1691[2
 Margaret, of ,, Jan. 7, 1693[4
 Abigail, of ,, Jan. 6, 1694[5
 Nathaniel, of Nathl., Apr. 7, 1695.
 Mary, of ,, Apr. 18, 1697.
 Nathanael, of ,, Nov. 5, 1699.

HENCKLEY.

George, of Meheta., July 10, 1720.

HENDERSON.

1693 May or June. John.
 Prior to 1786. Benjamin.
 " " " Mary.
 " " " Sarah.
 Agnes, of John, May 13, 1694.
 Joseph, } twins of,, May 3, 1696.
 Mary, }
 Margaret, of ,, Jan. 21, 1699.

HENDRY.

Ann, of Ann, May 6, 1711.
 Thomas, of Dec. 21, 1712.
 Ann, of Nov. 7, 1714.
 Sophia, of Aug. 19, 1716.
 Daniel, of Ann, Nov. 9, 1718.

HENLEY.

Thomas, of Eleanor, Sept. 15, 1717.

HENNING.

1729 Nov. 9. Mary.

HENYKES.

Richard, of S. Nov. 27, 1720.
 Mary, of ,, Nov. 27, 1720.
 Elizabeth, of ,, Nov. 27, 1720.

HERMAN, or HERMON.

1677 Apr. or May. S.
 1689 Oct. 27. Samuel.
 Samuel, of Samuel, Sept. 18, 1692.
 Sarah, of ,, Aug. 2, 1696.

HETT.

1677[8 Jan. 20. S.

HEWEN.

1699 Nov. 19. Mercy.

HEWINS.

1683 July 29. Martha.

HIBBINS, or HIBBONS.

1725 June 27. Mary.
 Elizabeth, of Dec. 22, 1717.

HICHBORN.

1788 Elizabeth.
 1790 Elizabeth, jun.

HICKS.

1747 Zechariah.
 (from Lynn.)

HILIARD.

1684[5 Jan. 18. Lydia.
 1689 Oct. 6. Job.

HILL.

1691 Dec. 20. Rebecka.
 1697 June 13. Joseph.
 1718 Aug. 24. Mary.
 1727[8 Feb. 11. James.
 Mary, of Rebeckah, Dec. 27, 1691.
 Samuel, of ,, Mar. 27, 1692.
 Rebecka, of ,, Apr. 22, 1694.
 Hannah, of Sept. 16, 1694.
 John, of Henry, Jan. 9, 1697[8
 John, of ,, Aug. 11, 1700.
 Thomas, of ,, June 18, 1704.
 Abr'm., of Abraham, Oct. 13, 1700.
 James, of Apr. 16, 1710.
 Joshua, of Oct. 28, 1711.
 Joseph, of Apr. 18, 1714.
 Abraham, of Abigail
 (Halsey), May 14, 1732.
 Nathl., of ,, Dec. 9, 1733.
 Nathl., of ,, Apr. 4, 1736.
 Joseph, of ,, Aug. 28, 1737.
 Elizabeth, of ,, July 15, 1739.
 Abigail, of ,, Dec. 14, 1740.
 Esther, of James, Mar. 3, 1734.
 Turner, of ,, Feb. 29, 1735[6

Elizabeth, of James, Apr. 30, 1738.
Mary, of " Apr. 12, 1741.

HILTON.

1698 Apr. 3. Mary.

HINKS.

Elizabeth, of Eliza, Aug. 5, 1711.
James, of Sept. 16, 1711.

HIPPY.

1709 May 22. William.

HITCHCOCK.

1735 Apr. 27. Jacob.

HOBBIE(Y.)

1688[9 Feb. 24. Hannah.
1692[3 Jan. 15. Ann.
1723 Mar. 31. Charles.
1726 Mar. 6. Wensley.
1729 Mar. 9. William.

John, of Ann, July 9, 1693.
William, of Nov. 15, 1696.
Richard, of Feb. 20, 1697[8
Charles, of Apr. 9, 1699.
Edward, of July 13, 1701.
Winsley, of Sept. 30, 1705.
William, of Aug. 17, 1707.
Edward, of Jan. 16, 1708[9
Ann, of Apr. 1, 1711.
William, of Mar. 24, 1706.
Rachel, of Wensley
and Rachel, Apr. 8, 1733.
John, of " Apr. 2, 1734.
Wensley, of " Sept. 28, 1735.
Rachel, of " Aug. 28, 1737.
Ann, of " Oct. 1, 1738.

HOBBS.

1724 Apr. 12. Esther.
1724[5 Jan. 17. Josiah.
Sarah, of Esther, May 10, 1724.
Doreas, of Josiah
and Esther, May 8, 1726.
Hannah, of Josias, Jan. 5, 1728[9

HODGES.

1696 Nov. 8. Samuel.

HODGDEN, or HODGDON, or HODSDEN.

1710 Mar. 19. Susanna.
1728 Apr. 28. Nathanael.

Tabitha, of Nathl., Jan. 10, 1702[3
Joseph, of " June 11, 1704.
Susannah, of " July 15, 1705.

Patience, of Nathl., Sept. 1, 1706.
Elizabeth, of " July 1, 1708.
Mary, Jan. 21, 1710[1
Ann, of Nathaniel, Oct. 3, 1731.
Mary, of " Nov. 25, 1733.
Tabitha, of " Nov. 2, 1735.
Ann, of Nathaniel
and Ann, Mar. 6, 1737.
Tabitha, of Nathl., June 17, 1739.

HODGKINS.

1768 Dec. 4. Lydea.

HOLLAND.

1666 Apr. 29. S.
[Wife of Christopher.] (?)
1677 Apr. 13. Bridget.
1700 Dec. 15. Christopher.
1725 Mar. 28. Sarah.
1725 Apr. 4. Susanna.
1727[8 Feb. 4. Susanna.

Elizab., of Elizabeth, Jan. 30, 1703[4
John, of Susanna, Jan. 30, 1708[9
Susannah, of " June 4, 1710.
Thomas, of " Sept. 30, 1711.
Josiah, of " Mar. 22, 1713.
Christoph., of " Jan. 9, 1714[5
Hannah, of " Feb. 3, 1716[7
Sarah, of " Feb. 1, 1718[9
Mary, of " Jan. 22, 1720[1

HOLLOWAY.

Sarah, of Ann, May 8, 1690.
Ward, of " Aug. 6, 1693.
Ebenezer, of " Nov. 17, 1695.

Ho(L)MES.

1680 Nov. 7. Samuel.
1688 Dec. 2. Margaret.
1714 Mar. 14. Robert.

Rebec., of Rebeckah, Mar. 3, 1695.
Francis, of " Mar. 22, 1696.
John, of " Nov. 7, 1697.
Ann, of " July 9, 1699.
Rebeckah, of " Dec. 22, 1700.
Isaac, of " Jan. 3, 1702[3
Ebenezer, of " Nov. 12, 1704.
Nathanael, of " Nov. 4, 1705.
Ann, of " Apr. 13, 1707.
William, of Robert, Jan. 13, 1716[7
Abiah, of " Dec. 14, 1718.

HOLYOKE.

Edward, of Jacob, Dec. 23, 1733.

HOOD.

1700 Sept. 15. Judith.

Elizabeth, of Judith, Sept. 29, 1700.
 Mary, of Feb. 22, 1701[2
 Sarah, of Feb. 22, 1701[2
 Mary, of Mar. 11, 1705.
 Sarah, of July 27, 1707.
 Ann, of Dec. 25, 1709.
 Joseph, of Mar. 8, 1713.
 Joseph, of Nov. 6, 1715.
 Cumby, of Sept. 1, 1717.
 Margaret, of Dec. 30, 1722.

HOPKINS.

1694 Elizabeth.
 1694 Mary.
 1695 Mar. 17. Mehetabel.
 1706 Aug. 11. Hannah.
 1740[1 Feb. 15. Abigail.
 1770 Dec. 30. Mary.
 Sara, of July 30, 1693.
 Mehetabel, of Mar. 4, 1694.
 Benjamin, of above, Mar. 4, 1694.
 John, of „ July 20, 1695.
 Joseph, of Aug. 4, 1700.
 John, of Sus., Mar. 12, 1721.
 Phebe, of Sept. 9, 1722.
 Abigail, of Jan. 12, 1723[4

HOUGH.

1691 June or July. William.
 1691 June or July. Mary.
 1718 Apr. 6. Ebenezer.
 1727[8 Feb. 11. Hannah.

Joseph, of William
 and Mary, July 12, 1691.
 Abigail, of „ „ Feb. 11, 1693[4
 William, of William, Feb. 9, 1695[6
 Lydia, of „ Feb. 6, 1697[8
 Ebenezer, of „ Feb. 11, 1699[0
 Ebenezer, of Ebenezer, June 28, 1724.
 Hannah, of „ Dec. 26, 1725.
 Sarah, of „ June 18, 1727.
 Mary, of Ebenezer
 and Hannah, June 9, 1728.

HOW.

1665 May 14. S.
 1727 Dec. 24. Mary.
 1730 May 3. Mary.
 John, of Abigail, Nov. 10, 1706.
 Abigail, of Sept. 12, 1708.
 Abigail, of Oct. 29, 1710.
 Mary, of Apr. 1, 1711.
 Sarah, of May 25, 1712.
 Joseph, of Oct. 25, 1713.
 James, of Dec. 27, 1713.

Elizabeth, of Jan. 9, 1714[5
 Abigail, of Nov. 6, 1715.

HOWARD.

1678 Nov. 3. S.
 1682[3 Jan. 28. Robert.
 1704 May 28. Mary.
 1704 May 28. Abigail.
 1727[8 Jan. 7. Mary.
 1727[8 Feb. 4. B.
 1727[8 Feb. 4. Judith.
 1790 Lucy.
 1797 Martha.

Mary, of Mary, June 4, 1704.
 James, of Nov. 16, 1707.
 Sarah, of Aug. 7, 1709.
 Mary, of Dec. 24, 1710.
 James, of Aug. 15, 1714.
 James, of Mar. 4, 1716.
 Amos, } of Feb. 4, 1727[8
 Judith, }
 Amos, of above, Feb. 4, 1727[8
 Judith, of „ Feb. 4, 1727[8
 Enoch, of „ Mar. 3, 1728.
 Benjamin, of July 21, 1728.
 Ebenezer, of Amos
 and Judith, Oct. 18, 1730.
 Nathaniel, of „ „ June 24, 1733.
 Elizabeth, of „ „ Nov. 23, 1735.
 Thomas, of „ „ May 1, 1737.

HOWEL(L).

1737 Sept. 11. Mary.

Phillip, of Feb. 28, 1713[4
 Newberry, of Sept. 29, 1717.
 Mary, of Mary, Oct. 15, 1737.
 Phillip, of „ Oct. 14, 1739.

HUBBARD.

Richard, of Eliz., Apr. 16, 1699.

HUDSON.

1672 Oct. 20. Francis.
 1677 May 18. S.
 1695 June 9. William.
 1700 July 21. Abigail.
 1701 Apr. 6. Francis.
 1726 May 29. John.

Samuel, of Apr. 17, 1692.
 Mary, of Francis, June 1, 1701.
 Mercy, of „ Aug. 22, 1703.
 Mary, of „ Dec. 7, 1707.
 John, of „ Sept. 18, 1709.
 Abigail, of „ Dec. 30, 1711.
 Elizabeth, of „ Sept. 12, 1714.
 William, of „ Aug. 12, 1716.

Martha, of Francis, Oct. 6, 1717.
Elizabeth, „ Mar. 29, 1719.

HUGHES.

1691 Nov. 1. Elizabeth.
1769 Oct. 22. Rosannah.

Elizabeth, of Eliza., Mar. 31, 1695.

HULL.

1673 Nov. 2. S.

HUMNEY.

Joseph, of Jan. 26, 1723[4

HUNLOCK.

1695 June 30. Mary.

HUNT.

1675 Aug. 8. S.
1680 Nov. 7. Thomas.
1689 Apr. 7. Mehetabel.
1716[7 Feb. 17. Ebenezer.
1717 Sept. 1. Samuel.
1720 Dec. 18. Mary.
1733 Oct. 14. Benjamin.
1737 Mar. 6. John.
Prior to 1786. Ephraim.

Samuel, of Feb. 9, 1689[0
of Thomas, Aug. 28, 1692.
Ebenezer, of „ Oct. 13, 1695.
Sarah, of „ Aug. 30, 1702.
Thomas, of „ Aug. 13, 1704.
Ephraim, of „ Dec. 16, 1705.
Judith, of „ Jan. 4, 1707[8
Palsgrave, of „ Feb. 25, 1710[1
Rebeckah, of John, Mar. 23, 1712.
Ann, of „ May 3, 1713.
Joanna, of „ Oct. 19, 1712.
Mary, of „ Jan. 25, 1712[3
Samuel, of „ July 31, 1715.
John, of „ Nov. 25, 1716.
Mary, of Samuel, Oct. 26, 1718.
Samuel, of „ Jan. 22, 1720[1
Elizabeth, of „ Aug. 26, 1722.
Elizabeth, of „ Sept. 27, 1724.
Samuel, of „ June 11, 1727.
Ephraim, of Samuel
and Mary, June 23, 1728.
Sarah, of Samuel, July 25, 1731.
Rebecka, of „ Sept. 5, 1736.
Mary, of John, Jan. 27, 1739[0

HUNTING.

1725 May 23. Mary.

Mary, of June 5, 1698.
(of Charlestown.)

Joseph, of Sept. 1, 1700.
Mary, of „ June 16, 1717.
Mary, of „ June 29, 1718.
Samuel, of „ Oct. 22, 1721.
John, of „ June 26, 1726.
Nathl. of Mary, Oct. 6, 1728.
Jonathan, of „ Sept. 20, 1730.
Lydia, } twins of Sept. 3, 1732.
Mercy, }
William, of Mary, Mar. 23, 1735.
Hannah, of „ Sept. 18, 1737.

HURST.

Samuel, of Feb. 6, 1703[4
Mary, of Mary, May 19, 1706.
Samuel, of „ July 20, 1707.
Mehetabel, of „ Aug. 31, 1707.
Samuel, of „ July 4, 1708.
Mehetabel, of „ May 29, 1709.
Susannah, of „ Jan. 7, 1710[1
Elizabeth, of „ June 22, 1712.
Samuel, of Eliza, Apr. 27, 1735.
John, of „ „ Apr. 27, 1735.
William, of „ „ Feb. 27, 1736[7

HUTCHINSON.

1655 Nov. 9 to
June 3, 1657. S.
1691 July to Sept. Elizabeth.
1700 May 5. Edward.
1706 Mar. 3. Thomas.
1706 Mar. 3. Sarah.
1707 June 22. Lydia.
1717[8 Feb. 9. Benjamin.
1717[8 Feb. 9. Ann.
1727[8 Jan. 7. Sarah.
1727[8 Jan. 7. Abigail.
1732 Dec. 10. Hannah.
1770 Dec. 3. Mary.
Foster, of Sarah, Sept. 24, 1704.
Sarah, of Thomas
and Sarah, Apr. 4, 1708.
Abigail, of „ „ „ Aug. 7, 1709.
Thomas, of „ „ „ Sept. 16, 1711.
Hannah, of „ „ „ Nov. 7, 1714.
Elisha, of „ „ „ Feb. 12, 1715[6
Lydia, of „ „ „ June 2, 1717.
Hawkins, of „ „ „ Feb. 19, 1720[1
Elizabeth, of „ „ „ May 19, 1723.
Foster, of „ „ „ Sept. 13, 1724.
Edward, of „ „ „ Mar. 27, 1726.
Elisha, of Edward
and Lydia, Feb. 20, 1708[9
Lydia, of „ „ „ „ „ July 30, 1710.
John, of „ „ „ „ „ Sept. 30, 1711.
Elizabeth, of „ „ „ „ „ May 24, 1713.
Lydia, of „ „ „ „ „ Oct. 3, 1714.
Edward, of „ „ „ „ „ Jan. 29, 1715[6

Elizabeth, of Edward
and Lydia, Mar. 10, 1717.
Mary, of Edward, Aug. 24, 1718.
Sarah, of „, May 13, 1722.
Lydia, of Edward
and Lydia, Feb. 2, 1723[4
Edward, of „, „ Dec. 21, 1729.
Elizabeth, of „, „ Dec. 5, 1731.

HUTTON.

William, of Ann, Feb. 11, 1710[1
Ann, of „, May 23, 1714.

INGELDSBY, or INGOLDSBY.

1689 Dec. 1. Ruhamah.

Thomas, of Ruhamah, 1691.
Ruhamah, of „, May 20, 1694.

INGERSON, or INGERSTONE.

1709 May 22. George.
Prior to 1786. Abraham.
1772 June. Abraham.

George, of George, May 29, 1709.
Abraham, of (dead), July 29, 1711.

INGOLS.

1713 Sept. 20. Anna.

Hannah, of Hannah, July 18, 1708.
James, of „, Apr. 22, 1711.
Rebeckah, of „, Jan. 25, 1712[3
Robert, of „, July 17, 1715.

INGERHAM, or INGRAM.

Joseph, of Joseph, July 11, 1714.
Francis, of „, May 13, 1716.
Mary, of „, Aug. 18, 1717.
Elizabeth, of „, Oct. 5, 1718.
Hannah, of „, Oct. 23, 1720.
Lydia, of „, Nov. 11, 1722.
Elizabeth, of „, June 6, 1725.
Duncan, of Joseph, Jan. 29, 1726[7
Mackfarland, of „, July 7, 1728.
John, of „, Sept. 21, 1729.
Sarah, of Joseph, Oct. 18, 1730.
Rebecca, of „, Oct. 15, 1732.
John, of „, Sept. 1, 1734.

IRELAND.

1693 May or June. Grace.

Grace, of Grace, Jan. 15, 1692[3
Mary, of „, Mar. 8, 1696.
Nathaniel, of „, July 17, 1698.

IVORY.

1771 Sept. Sarah.

JACKSON.

1681 Eliza.
1702 Feb. 21. Mary.
1733 Oct. 28. Susanna.
Jonathan, of „, May 4, 1701.
Mary, of „, Apr. 4, 1703.
Daniel, of „, Apr. 20, 1707.
Sarah, of „, Feb. 17, 1716[7
of Susannah, Sept. 29, 1728.
John, of „, Aug. 22, 1731.
George, of „, June 5, 1737.
Timothy, of „, Dec. 31, 1738.
Joseph, of „, Jan. 4, 1740[1

JACOB(s).

Thomas, of Mary, June 7, 1696.
James, of „, Mar. 13, 1698.
Mary, of „, Feb. 18, 1699[0
of „, May 23, 1703.

JAG(g)ER.

1725 May 9. Mary.
Lydia, of „, June 8, 1712.
Susannah, of „, May 7, 1716.

JAMDSOY.

Abigail, of „, May 21, 1710.
Sarah, of „, Oct. 14, 1711.

JARVIS.

1664 Dec. 11. S.
1690 May 25. Margaret.
1701[2 Feb. 9. Mary.
1710 Aug. 13. Margaret.
1725 May 30. Mary.
1727 Dec. 10. Abigail.
Prior to 1786. Mary.
„ „ „ Thomas.
Elias, of Margaret, Nov. 5, 1693.
Margaret, of „, Mar. 27, 1692.
Nathanael, of Eliz., Nov. 12, 1693.
Elizabeth, of „, July 26, 1696.
William, of „, Aug. 21, 1698.
Rebeckah, of „, Dec. 14, 1701.
John, of Mary, Mar. 18, 1716.
Abigail, of Abigail, Mar. 29, 1724.
Elizabeth, of „, Nov. 20, 1726.
Mercy, of „, Apr. 20, 1729.
Nathaniel, of „, Dec. 26, 1731.
Thomas, of „, May 12, 1734.

JEFFRIES.

1714[5 Jan. 23. Sarah.
John, of „, Mar. 27, 1709.
William, of „, May 4, 1712.

JENKINS.
 1673 Dec. 6. B.
 John, of Mary, Mar. 20, 1698.
 David, of „ Mar. 20, 1698.
 Mary, of „ July 6, 1701.
 Abigail, of Mary, Sept. 18, 1709.
 Mary, of „ Apr. 27, 1712.
 Thomas, of „ Dec. 26, 1714.
 John, of Sarah, Apr. 15, 1716.
 Mary, of „ Mar. 8, 1719.
 Peter, of „ June 30, 1717.
 Mary, of „ July 5, 1719.
 David, of „ Feb. 12, 1720[1
 Matthew, of „ May 7, 1721.

JENNER.
 1685[6 Jan. 17. David.
 Elizabeth, of David, Aug. 2, 1696.
 David, of „ „ July 9, 1699.

JENNINGS.
 1690 May 12. Ann.

JEPSON.
 1732[3 Jan. 7. Sarah.

JEWEL, or JUEL.
 1689 June 23. Eleanor.
 Mary, of Mary, Nov. 11, 1705.
 Joseph, of „ Sept. 5, 1708.

JINKS.
 1682 Oct. 29. Richard.

JOHNSON.
 1685 Dec. 27. Elizabeth.
 1691[2 Feb. 14. Christian.
 1700 Apr. 21. Stephen.
 1704 Oct. 15. Mary.
 1726 Apr. 3. Mercy.
 Ruth, of „ May 8, 1692.
 Thomas, of Zechary, July 17, 1692.
 John, of Rebecca, Feb. 26, 1692[3
 Mary, of „ Mar. 21, 1703.
 Nathaniel, of Ste-
 phen and Mary, Mar. 21, 1703.

JOLES.
 1682 Oct. 29. Hannah.

JONES.
 1663 Nov. 15. S.
 1695 June 9. James.
 1708 Nov. 21. Samuel.
 1710 Nov. 5. Mary.

1729 June 22. Mary.
 1734 Sept. 1. Thomas.
 James, of Susanna, Dec. 28, 1690.
 Anna, of „ „ May 1, 1692.
 Mercy, of „ „ May 6, 1694.
 Sarah, of „ „ June 14, 1696.
 Mary, of „ „ May 19, 1700.
 Ebenezer, of „ „ Nov. 14, 1703.
 Rebecca, of Thomas, Jan. 27, 1711[2
 Samuel, of „ „ Sept. 30, 1711.
 Bethiah, of „ „ May 23, 1714.
 Thomas, of „ „ Sept. 2, 1716.
 Phillip, of Ann, „ „ July 28, 1717.
 Abigail, of „ „ Oct. 11, 1719.
 Susannah, of „ „ July 16, 1721.
 Thomas, of „ „ Aug. 25, 1723.

KAMLIN.
 1691 June or July. Agnes.

KARR.
 1673 Nov. 9. S.

KEACH.
 1681[2 Jan. 8. John.
 1691 „ „ July to Sept. Abigail.

KELLOND.
 1675 Apr. 4. S.
 1717[8 Feb. 16. Mary.

KEL(L)Y.
 1655 Nov. 9 to
 June 3, 1657. S.
 1683 Apr. 15. Emm.
 1690 Apr. 14. Martha.
 1708[9 Feb. 27. Elizabeth.
 Saml., } twins of E., Apr. 16, 1693.
 Mary, }

KEMBE.
 1714 July 11. Elizabeth.

KEMBLE.
 1660[1 Jan. 6. S.
 1681 Sept. 18. Elizabeth.
 1708 Sept. 5. Richard.
 1710 Oct. 1. Jonathan.
 1713 Mar. 15. Ebenezer.
 Katharine, of K., July 23, 1699.
 Elizabeth, of L., May 17, 1702.
 Hannah, of „ „ May 17, 1702.
 Joseph, of „ „ May 17, 1702.
 Christo., of Sarah, Sept. 6, 1702.
 Mary, of „ „ May 30, 1703.

Abigail, of Sarah, Jan. 30, 1703[4
Thos., of Katharine, May 30, 1703.
Daniel, of „ Feb. 16, 1706[7
Mary, of „ Aug. 7, 1709.
Jona., of Jonathan, Oct. 15, 1710.
Samuel, of „ Apr. 5, 1713.
John, of Richard, Nov. 12, 1710.
Elizab., of Ebenezer, Mar. 22, 1713.
Elizabeth, of „ Aug. 12, 1716.
Hannah, of Dec. 14, 1712.
Dorothy, of Sept. 26, 1714.
Hannah, of Dec. 5, 1714.
Hannah, of Dec. 12, 1714.
Mary, of May 4, 1718.

KENNET.

1689 Aug. 18. Susanna.

KENN(E)Y.

1685 1. Robert.
1705[6 Feb. 17. Nathaniel.
1707 Dec. 28. Margaret.
1716 July 8. John.

Nathl., of Nathaniel, May 8, 1709.
Edward, of „ Mar. 2, 1712.

KENT.

1701 May 4. Joshua.
1725 Aug. 22. Margaret.
1790 Mary.

Joshua, of Joshua, Sept. 15, 1700.
John, of „ Sept. 15, 1700.
Agnes, of „ Sept. 27, 1702.
Sarah, of „ June 2, 1723.
Richard, of Sarah, Aug. 21, 1726.
William, of „ July 14, 1728.
Mary, of „ July 19, 1730.
Mary, of „ Nov. 21, 1731.
John, of „ Mar. 31, 1734.
Nathaniel, of „ Apr. 8, 1739.
Edward, of „ Mar. 22, 1730.
Nathaniel, of „ Aug. 29, 1736.
Elizab., of Margaret, Apr. 30, 1732.
John, of „ Nov. 27, 1737.

KERBY.

Richard, of Sarah, Mar. 13, 1715.

KETTLE.

1715 May 29. Mary.
1773 Oct. Joseph.

KEY(ES).

Jonathan, of Rachel, Oct. 2, 1709.
Rachel, of „ Mar. 21, 1714.
Bethia, of „ Aug. 17, 1718.

KEYN(E).

1670 S.
1682 Apr. 9. S.

KIDDER.

Stephen, of Stephen, Oct. 31, 1697.
(of Charlestown.)
Thomas, of Sept. 1, 1700.

KIMBAL.

1791 Abigail.

KING.

John, of Jan. 6, 1705[6
Elizabeth, of Jan. 19, 1706[7
Mary, of Mary, Feb. 20, 1708[9
William, of Sept. 4, 1709.
Nathanael, of Feb. 18, 1710[1
Richard, of Oct. 28, 1711.
Lydia, of Jan. 24, 1713[4
Peter, of Feb. 23, 1717[8
Nathanael, of Mary, Feb. 12, 1737[8

KINGSTON(E).

1721[2 Feb. 11. Martha.

Elias, of Martha, July 20, 1712.
Martha, of „ June 24, 1716.
William, of Jan. 3, 1719[0
Mary, of Martha, Dec. 11, 1720.
Mary, of Dec. 8, 1723.
William, of Martha, Sept. 4, 1726.
John, of „ Mar. 16, 1729.

KNIGHT.

1715[6 Feb. 12. Samuel.
1718 Mar. 16. Ebenezer.

Mehetabel, of July 25, 1714.
Elizabeth, of Mar. 31, 1717.
Elizabeth, of Aug. 18, 1717.
Sarah, of Nov. 23, 1718.
Samuel, of Samuel, Aug. 28, 1720.

LAKE.

1655 Nov. 9 to
June 3, 1657. S.
1670 or 1671. Thomas.

LAMBERT.

1725 Apr. 4. Mary.
1725 Aug. 22. Jonathan.

John, of Nov. 1, 1719.
Jonathan, of June 10, 1722.
Mary, of Sept. 13, 1724.
Jonathan, of June 6, 1725.
Benjamin, of Jona.
and Mary, Nov. 13, 1726.

Elizabeth, of Jonathan and Mary, July 5, 1730.
Elizabeth, of Aug. 25, 1728.
Thomas, of Feb. 1, 1735[6]

LAMBSHEAD.

1673 Apr. 6. S.

LANE.

1655 Nov. 9, to
June 3, 1657. B.
1681 Mar. 1, William.
1681 May 29. S.

LANGDON.

1705 Nov. 4. John.
1718 Apr. 6. Edward.
Ephraim, of Jan. 26, 1689[0
Mary, of John, Nov. 15, 1691.
Joanna, of J., Oct. 22, 1693.
Nathaniel, of Sept. 14, 1695.
Margaret, of Aug. 29, 1697.
Edward, of John, Oct. 23, 1698.
John, of Edward, Jan. 20, 1722[3
Edward, of „ June 14, 1724.
Susanna, of Edward
and Susan, May 7, 1727.
Timothy, of Edward, Feb. 18, 1732[3

LANGLEY.

Elizabeth, of July 10, 1698.
(of Charlestown.)

LARRABEE.

1713 Sept. 20. William.
1739 Dec. 2. Samuel.

Stephen, of Dec. 13, 1719.
Lydia, of Jan. 13, 1722[3
James, of William, May 2, 1725.
Benjamin, of „ Aug. 7, 1726.
Abigail, of „ Mar. 31, 1728.

LARYFORD.

1693[4 Jan. 21. Sara.
Elizabeth, of Sarah, Mar. 4, 1694.

LASENBY, or LISSENBY.

1717 May 12. Joseph.
1737 May 22. Joseph, jun.
1737 May 22. Elizabeth.
Thomas, of Mercy, June 10, 1693.
Benjamin, of „ June 17, 1693.
Joseph, of „ Sept. 2, 1694.
Mercy, of „ Apr. 26, 1696.
Margaret, of „ Apr. 2, 1699.

Mary, of Mercy, Nov. 16, 1701.
Joseph, of Feb. 7, 1719[0
Mary, of Jos., May 28, 1721.
Mary, of Dec. 30, 1722.
Benjamin, of Joseph, June 14, 1724.
Thomas, of „ Oct. 10, 1725.
Eliza, of „ June 4, 1727.
Samuel, of „ June 23, 1728.
Mary, of Joseph
and Mary, Aug. 17, 1729.
Benjamin, of Joseph, Oct. 1, 1732.
Thomas, of „ Feb. 24, 1733[4
Mercy, of „ Oct. 5, 1735.

LASH.

1693 Mar. 5. Joanna.

LATHROP, or LOTHROP.

Prior to 1786. JOHN, pastor.
„ „ Elizabeth.
1773 „ July 11. Mary.
1799 „ Jane Tyler.

Elizabeth, of Eliza, Sept. 4, 1692.

LATTY.

John, of Apr. 27, 1718.
Ann, of Mar. 30, 1720.

LAWLER.

Thomas, of Eliza, Apr. 3, 1720.

LAWRENCE.

Samuel, of Daniel, May 22, 1698.
(of Charlestown.)

LAWSON.

1690 May 25. John.
Ann, of John, Nov. 10, 1700.
Sarah, of „ Mar. 29, 1702.
John, { twins of John, } July 16, 1704.
Savil, { lately dead, }

LAX.

1725 May 2. Mary.

LEADER.

1655 Nov. 9, to
June 3, 1657. S.

LEATHERBY.

William, of William, May 29, 1709.
William, of Oct. 22, 1710.
William, of William, Mar. 23, 1712.
Jonathan, of „ Oct. 11, 1713.
Lydia, of „ Oct. 11, 1713.
Samuel, of Dec. 25, 1715.
Lydia, of Dec. 15, 1717.

LEBLONDE.

1690	Mar. 2.	Ann.
James, of	Anne,	Apr. 21, 1690.
James, of	"	June 7, 1691.
Ann, of	"	Apr. 9, 1693.
Peter, of	"	Jan. 6, 1694[5]
Gabriel, of	"	Mar. 6, 1698.
Ann, of	"	Dec. 15, 1700.
Phillippa, of	"	Apr. 23, 1704.
Mary Ann, of	"	Mar. 10, 1706.
Alexander, of	"	Sept. 4, 1709.

LEE.

1687	Apr. 24.	Anna.
Thomas, of		Sept. 5, 1703.
Deborah, of		Oct. 8, 1704.
George, of		July 28, 1706.
Stephen, of		June 22, 1707.
	(of Chebacco.)	
William, of		Sept. 28, 1707.
David, of		Nov. 30, 1707.
Martha, of		Mar. 19, 1710.
Joseph, of		Mar. 25, 1711.
Benjamin, of		Apr. 17, 1715.
Martha, of		June 8, 1718.

LEGARE.

1695	July 28.	Solomon.
Sarah, of	Solomon,	July 28, 1695.

LEIGHTON, or L(A)YTON.

1727[8	Jan. 7.	Abigail.
Michael, of		Nov. 15, 1713.
Isaac, of		Jan. 1, 1715[6]
Abigail, of	Abigail,	Jan. 21, 1727[8]
Joseph, of	"	Jan. 21, 1727[8]
Eliza, of	"	Jan. 21, 1727[8]
Mary, of	"	Jan. 21, 1727[8]
David, of		June 13, 1731.

LEMAN.

1713	Sept. 20.	Nathanael.
Nathaniel, of	Nathl.,	Aug. 8, 1703.
Elizabeth, of	"	Nov. 26, 1704.
Mary, of		Feb. 23, 1717[8]

LENDALL.

Mary, of	Joanna,	Jan. 29, 1715[6]
----------	---------	------------------

LENDE.

1708	Dec. 5.	Jonas.
------	---------	--------

LEATHERLAND.

1694		Deborah.
------	--	----------

LEWIS.

1730	Mar. 22.	Elizabeth.
Prior to 1786.		Thomas.
Phillip, of	Martha,	Jan. 9, 1703[4]
Samuel, of	"	Feb. 17, 1705[6]
Martha, of	"	Feb. 29, 1707[8]
Thomas, of	"	Jan. 7, 1710[1]
Elizabeth, of	"	Sept. 20, 1713.
Isaac, of	Hannah,	Aug. 30, 1713.
John, of	"	Aug. 30, 1713.
Hannah, of	"	Aug. 30, 1713.
William, of	"	June 13, 1714.
Deborah, of	"	Mar. 23, 1718.
Sarah, of	Eliza,	Apr. 12, 1730.
Susanna, of	Eliza.,	July 11, 1731.
Joseph, of	"	Feb. 17, 1733[4]
Elizabeth, of	"	Dec. 28, 1735.
Sarah, of	"	Apr. 30, 1738.
Joseph, of	"	Jan. 25, 1740[1]

LILLY, or LILLIE.

1682	Apr. 9.	Samuel.
1713	Sept. 20.	Elizabeth.
Theophilus, of	Sam.,	Aug. 24, 1690.
Samuel, of	"	June 5, 1692.
Mehetabel, of	"	Feb. 4, 1693[4]
Elizabeth, of	"	Mar. 1, 1696.
Edward, of	"	Feb. 27, 1697[8]
Abigail, of	"	Nov. 19, 1699.
Samuel, of	Hannah,	May 1, 1726.
John, of	"	Aug. 11, 1728.
Theophilus, of	"	Aug. 23, 1730.

LINFIELD.

1715	Oct. 30.	David.
Abigail, of	David,	Aug. 20, 1721.

LITTLE.

1769	Mar. 19.	Deborah.
------	----------	----------

LORIN(G).

1698	May 22.	Daniel.
1701[2	Feb. 9.	Nathanael.
1770	Sept. 9.	Margaret.
Daniel, of	Daniel,	Mar. 31, 1700.
Sarah, of	"	Nov. 16, 1701.
Daniel, of	"	Oct. 31, 1703.
Isaac, of	"	Dec. 2, 1705.
Nathanael, of	"	Feb. 20, 1708[9]
Priscilla, of	"	Jan. 17, 1713[4]
Nathanael, of	Nathanael,	Sept. 3, 1704.
Rachel, of	"	Jan. 7, 1710[1]
Nathaniel, of	"	June 14, 1713.

Thomas, of Nathl., Aug. 28, 1715.
 Israel, of „ May 26, 1717.
 Matthew, of „ Feb. 14, 1719[0]

LOVE.

Bennet, of Susannah, July 4, 1703.
 John, of „ Aug. 19, 1705.
 John, of „ Dec. 22, 1706.
 Susannah, of „ Mar. 13, 1709.

LOVEL.

1717[8 Feb. 23. Jane.

Low, or LOE.

Wm., of Elizabeth, Mar. 30, 1718.
 Elizabeth, of „ Feb. 21, 1719[0]

LOWDEN.

Mary, of Eliza, Mar. 30, 1720.

LOWELL, or LOWLE.

Rachel, July 13, 1701.
 Mary, of Dec. 3, 1710.

LOYD.

1710 Nov. 5. Elizabeth.

LUIST.

1688 June 24. Robert.

LUPTON.

Rebeckah, of Rebeck., Apr. 5, 1724.
 Rebeckah, of „ Oct. 17, 1725.
 David, of „ Sept. 10, 1738.

LYMAN.

1712 May 18. Caleb.

McKARTY.

Elizabeth, of Mary, Apr. 30, 1693.

MACKIENY, or MACKENNY.

1723 Nov. 10. Lydia.
 1781 Margaret.

Lydia, of Lydia, Mar. 15, 1719.

MAFFEN, or MATTIN.

Sarah, of Eleanor, Apr. 23, 1721.
 Ann, of „ Aug. 8, 1725.
 Ann, of „ Apr. 2, 1727.
 Eleanor, of „ June 9, 1728.
 Margaret, of „ Aug. 9, 1730.

MALLADGE.

John, of Aug. 31, 1712.

MALSEY.

1708 Sept. 5. Eliza.

MAN.

Ann, of Priscilla, May 16, 1714.
 James, of „ Nov. 28, 1714.

MANSIL(L).

1664 Dec. 11. Katharine.
 1687 May 22. Samuel.

MAREHAM.

William, of Dec. 13, 1713.

MARET, or MERRIT.

1705[6 Jan. 27. Philip.
 1711 June 3. Mary.
 1732 Aug. 20. Eunice.

Mary, of Philip, Feb. 18, 1704[5
 John, of „ Feb. 18, 1704[5
 Daniel, of „ Feb. 18, 1704[5
 Susannah, of „ Apr. 14, 1706.
 Henry, of „ July 13, 1707.
 Rachel, of „ July 10, 1709.
 Experience, of „ Dec. 31, 1710.
 Jacob, of „ Feb. 24, 1711[2
 Rachel, of „ Mar. 28, 1714.
 Sarah, of „ July 24, 1715.
 Ebenezzer, of „ June 2, 1717.
 Experience, of „ June 2, 1717.
 Daniel, of Daniel, Aug. 6, 1727.
 David, of „ Mar. 16, 1729.
 „ May 10, 1730.
 John, of „ Feb. 27, 1731[2
 Sarah, of Eunice, Feb. 24, 1733[4
 William, of „ June 15, 1735.
 Lydia, of Daniel, Sept. 13, 1741.

MARSHALL.

Thebe, of Dec. 6, 1713.
 William, of Nov. 13, 1715.
 Hannah, of June 1, 1718.
 Mary, of Sept. 12, 1725.
 Sarah, of William, Feb. 17, 1739[0]

MARTYN, or MARTIN.

1678 June 2. S.
 1693 May 14. Edward.
 1693[4 Jan. 21. Susanna.

Michael, of Sarah, Feb. 26, 1692[3
 Mary, of Mar. 17, 1695.
 Sarah, of Edward
 and Sarah, May 30, 1697.
 Edward, of „ Oct. 22, 1699.
 John, of „ June 21, 1702.
 Richard, of „ Sept. 19, 1703.
 John, of Edward, May 12, 1706.
 Susannah, of „ Feb. 27, 1708[9
 Nathaniel, of Edward
 and Sarah, Dec. 16, 1711.

Elizabeth, of Edwd., May 16, 1714.
 Abigail, of „ July 22, 1716.
 Samuel, of Nathaniel, Oct. 21, 1716.
 Nathaniel, of „ Aug. 3, 1718.
 Susannah, of Susan., Jan. 21, 1721[2
 Sarah, of „ July 11, 1725.
 Thomas, of „ Oct. 14, 1733.

MARVEL.

Elizabeth, of Apr. 17, 1709.

MARVIN.

Jane, of Mar. 18, 1711.
 Mary, of June 14, 1713.

MASON.

1676 May 22. B.
 1676 May 22. S.
 1691 Dec. 20. John.

Nathaniel, of Nathl., Feb. 10, 1711[2
 Nathaniel, of „ Mar. 30, 1720.

MASTEN.

John, of Rebecca, July 21, 1728.

MATHER.

1663 Mar. 10. INCREASE.
 1663 Mar. 10. Maria.
 1679 Aug. 31. COTTON.
 1682 25. Maria.
 1689 Aug. 25. Abigail.
 1690 Mar. 23. Elizabeth.
 1690 Mar. 23. Sara.
 1694 Abigail.
 1700 Mar. 10. Jerusha.
 1705 Feb. 24. Elizabeth.
 1714[5 Jan. 16. Katharin.
 1714[5 Jan. 16. Abigail.
 1722 Dec. 22. SAMUEL.
 1727 Nov. 19. Hannah.

Mary (the minister's

child), Nov. 8, 1691.
 Abigail, „ June 17, 1694.
 Mehetabel, „ Dec. 8, 1695.
 Hannah, „ Feb. 7, 1696[7
 Increase, „ July 9, 1699.
 Samuel, „ Dec. 15, 1700.
 Elizabeth, „ July 16, 1704.
 Samuel, „ Nov. 3, 1706.
 Nathanael, „ May 22, 1709.
 Jerusha, „ April 8, 1711.
 Eleazar, } twins, } Nov. 1, 1713.
 Martha, } above, }
 Samuel, of Rev. Mr.
 and Hannah, Feb. 13, 1736[7
 Thomas, of Rev. Mr.
 Saml. & Hannah, Aug. 13, 1738.

Elizabeth (minis-
 ter's child), Mar. 2, 1740.
 Increase, „ Sept. 20, 1741.

MATTOCKS, or MATTOX.

1686 Nov. 7. Samuel.
 1688 Nov. 4. S. Constant.
 1691 Mar. 15. Elizabeth.

Diana, of Henry, Nov. 27, 1698.
 Elizabeth, of „ Mar. 16, 1701.

MAVERICK.

1715[16 Eliza.

John, of Sept. 16, 1711.
 Paul, of Apr. 18, 1714.
 Elizabeth, of Eliza, Mar. 11, 1716.
 Jotham, of Mar. 23, 1718.
 Jemimah, of Feb. 14, 1719[0
 Ann, of Dec. 10, 1721.

MAY.

Thomas, of Jane, Mar. 9, 1707.
 Herrington, of Nov. 28, 1708.
 (of Charlestown.)

MAYER.

1707 Dec. 28. Alice.
 1722 Dec. 9. Hannah.

Patience, of Hannah, Jan. 1, 1698[9
 Mary, of Ralf, May 29, 1715.
 Henry, of „ May 29, 1715.
 Mary, of Ralph, Nov. 6, 1720.
 Mary, of „ Oct. 3, 1725.
 Hannah, of „ Mar. 31, 1728.

MAYO.

JOHN, Pastor.
 1659 Dec. 25. S.
 1660 May 13. Thomasin.

MEARS, MEERS, &c.

1740 July 20. Abigail.

Mary, of Maria, Sept. 18, 1698.
 Samuel, of Mary, Apr. 14, 1700.
 Katharine, of Mariah, Sept. 28, 1701.
 James, of „ Feb. 13, 1703[4
 Thomas, of Mary, June 4, 1710.
 Cumby, of Reb., Feb. 11, 1710[1
 Mary, of Sept. 27, 1713.
 Peter, of June 26, 1715.
 Abigail, of March 3, 1723.
 Mary, of Peter, July 15, 1739.

MELLIN(E)s.
1693 May or June. Thomas.
James, of Thomas, May 27, 1694.

MELVIN.
1730 March 1. Mercy.
1731 Aug. 15. Mercy.
Mercy, of Mercy, Sept. 11, 1720.
Mary, of „ Sept. 11, 1720.
Rebeckah, of „ Sept. 11, 1720.
James, of „ Sept. 11, 1720.
Elizabeth, of Aug. 26, 1722.
Jonathan, of Jan. 9, 1725[6]

MENZIES.
1740 Sept. 7. Rebecca.
John, of Rebecca, Nov. 30, 1740.

MERCHANT, or MARCHANT, &c.
1710 Apr. 23. Judith.
1725 Apr. 25. William.
1725 Apr. 25. Abigail.
Abigail, of Aug. 15, 1714.
Elizabeth, of Dec. 30, 1716.
William, of Oct. 26, 1718.
Martha, of Dec. 11, 1720.
William, of Aug. 12, 1722.
Martha, of William
and Abigail, Oct. 17, 1725.
Mercy, of „ Aug. 27, 1727.

METCALF.
1696 Aug. 23. John.
1708 Oct. 24. Nathanael.

MIACUM.
1709 Aug. 7. Mary.

MIDDLECOT.
1692 Mar. 20. Richard.

MILBORN.
William, of June 10, 1722.

MILK.
1716 Mar. 11. Mary.
1727[8 Feb. 11. James.
Mary, of Mar. 11, 1711.
John, of above, Mar. 11, 1711.
James, of „ Mar. 11, 1711.

MILLER.
1690 May 25. Matthew.

1788 Elizabeth.
Thomas, of Mar. 31, 1700.
Alice, of July 30, 1704.

MILLS.
1691 Oct. 4. Edward.
Edward, of Ed., Sept. 20, 1696.

MILTON.
John, of Oct. 4, 1713.
Theodocia, of Feb. 27, 1714[5
of Jan. 24, 1730[1

MOBERLY.
Thomas, of Mary
(Howard), Nov. 26, 1732.

MONK.
1687 Mar. 27. Christopher.
1691 July to Oct. Mary.
1716 Mar. 11. Mary.
Thomas, of Chris., Feb. 2, 1689[0
Ebenezer, of Christo-
pher and Mary, Jan. 31, 1691[2
Susannah, of Chris., May 17, 1696.
Mary, of Christopher
and Mary, June 23, 1700.
Mary, of George and
Mary, April 1, 1694.
Robert, of Mary, June 5, 1709.
Caleb, of June 17, 1711.

MOOR(E).
1655 Nov. 9, to
June 3, 1657. S.
1727[8 Jan. 7, Elizabeth.

Mary, of Mehet'l.
(Cock), Nov. 23, 1740.
Sarah, of „ „ Nov. 23, 1740.
Samuel, of „ „ Nov. 23, 1740.

MORE.
1682 Apr. 9. S.
1725 May 23. William.
1780 Nov. 5. Mary.
1790 Margeret.

Ann, and two more,
of Ann, Apr. 30, 1693.
William, of „ Aug. 4, 1695.
Robert, of „ June 20, 1697.
Ephraim, of Eliza, June 8, 1707.
William, of Sarah, Apr. 17, 1709.
Elizabeth, of Eliza, Nov. 24, 1728.
Ann, of Jan. 24, 1730[1

1670 MOREL.
B.

MOREY.
1691 Mar. 22. Susanna.

Edmund, of Susan., Mar. 29, 1691.
Israel, of „ July 5, 1691.
Ebenezer, of „ July 23, 1693.
Susannah, of „ Oct. 21, 1694.
Joseph, of „ Aug. 6, 1699.

MORGAN.
of Ralph, Oct. 12, 1712.

MORNE.
1699 Nov. 19. Elizabeth.

MORRIS.
Mercy, of Eliz., Mar. 10, 1700.

MORSE.
1705[6 Feb. 24. Daniel.

Elizabeth, of „ Mar. 4, 1711.

MORTIMER.
Richard, of Mar. 21, 1703.
John, of Sept. 3, 1704.
Mary, of John, Sept. 9, 1733.
John, of „ Sept. 9, 1733.
Richard, of „ Sept. 14, 1735.

MORTON.
1685 1. Hannah.

MOULDER.
1676 Apr. 30. S.

MOUNTFORT(H), or MOUNTFORD.

1693 May or June. John.
1698 May 22. Elizabeth.
1701 May 11. Mary.
1716 Mar. 11. Naomi.
1717 May 12. Benjamin.
1724 Aug. 30. Susanna.
1727 Dec. 24. Hannah.
1731 Sept. 26. Jonathan.
Prior to 1786. Hannah.

Edmund, of Oct. 21, 1694.
Benjamin, of John, Apr. 5, 1696.
Elizabeth, of „ Feb. 27, 1697[8
Mary, of „ Oct. 6, 1700.
John, of „ Mar. 7, 1703.
Joanna, of „ June 11, 1704.
Susannah, of „ Apr. 1, 1705.
Joshua, of „ Sept. 22, 1706.
Jonathan, of „ Sept. 26, 1708.

34

Hannah, of John, Jan. 21, 1710[1
Joseph, of „ Apr. 19, 1713.
Edmund, of „ May 26, 1717.
Edmund, of Elizab., May 29, 1698.
Elizabeth, of „ May 29, 1698.
William, of Mary, Oct. 6, 1700.
Elizab., of Jonathan, Feb. 3, 1705[6
Hannah, of „ Oct. 26, 1707.
Jonathan, of „ Nov. 26, 1710.
Sarah, of „ Mar. 8, 1713.

MOUNTJOY.
1675[6 Feb. 20. S.

MOWER.
Thomas, of Jan. 30, 1708[9
Ephraim, of Dec. 2, 1711.
Elizabeth, of Sept. 13, 1713.
Joanna, of Nov. 22, 1719.
Mary, of June 12, 1720.

MUNNINGS.
1655 Nov. 9 to
June 3, 1657. B.
1659 Nov. 27. Mahalael.

MUNSON.
1688 Aug. 12. Sarah.

MYNGS.
Christr., of Christr., Mar. 3, 1700.
Joyce, of „ Dec. 21, 1701.

MYRECK.
Gideon, of Jan. 25, 1740[1

NAPS.
Anna, of Nov. 6, 1737.

NARRAMORE.
1681 May 29. Hannah.
1702[3 Jan. 30. Samuel.

NASH.
Rebeckah, of Timo., Feb. 24, 1694[5

NEAL, or NEIL.
1736 Apr. 18. Sarah.

Mary, of Oct. 1, 1693.
John, of Andrew, Sept. 16, 1722.

NEED(H)AM.
1697 Apr. 25. John.
1697 Apr. 25. Ezekiel.
1701 Apr. 6. Keziah.
1727 Sept. 17. Mary.

Priscilla, of July 10, 1698.

Ezekiel, of Ezekiel, Mar. 10, 1700.
 Ezekiel, of „ Sept. 28, 1707.
 Mary, of „ Apr. 13, 1701.
 John, of Jan. 7, 1704[5
 Daniel, of Mary, Jan. 26, 1706[7
 Jane, of Jan. 11, 1707[8
 Susannah, of John, Mar. 20, 1709.
 John, of Dorothy, Mar. 11, 1739.

NEGROES.

1702 Aug. 23. Samuel.
 1702 Aug. 23. Katharine.
 1716 Nov. 25. Ruth George.
 1728 Nov. 17. James.
 1731 May 2. John Spanyard.
 1772 Aug. 9. B. Briston.

Richard, of Oct. 29, 1693.
 Two children of Samuel, Nov. 13, 1698.
 Abraham, of Ezer (minister's Negro), Feb. 17, 1722[3
 Margaret, of „ Jan. 8, 1726[7
 Dinah, of Cesar, Mar. 8, 1724.
 John, of Elizabeth, Feb. 20, 1725[6
 Lydia, of Woodby, Feb. 20, 1725[6
 Thos., of Eliza Woodby (a Negro), Nov. 7, 1731.
 Peter (Negro man), Feb. 25, 1727[8
 Tobias, „ „ Feb. 25, 1727[8
 Boston, „ „ Feb. 25, 1727[8
 Scipio, of Boston, Feb. 25, 1727[8
 Violet, of „ Feb. 25, 1727[8
 John (Negro man, free), June 30, 1728.
 Maria (Negro wom.), June 30, 1728.
 Jane, „ „ June 30, 1728.
 Elizab., of Elizabeth, Nov. 3, 1728.
 William, of Hagar, Dec. 8, 1728.
 Onesimus, of Onesimus and Hagar, Mar. 22, 1730.
 John, of „ „ Oct. 10, 1731.
 Onesimus, of Onesimus, May 5, 1734.
 Jane (a Negro woman), Apr. 5, 1730.
 Jane (servant of Mr. Fyfield), Apr. 4, 1731.
 Jane (servant of Mr. Saltonstall), Apr. 4, 1731.
 Ann, of above, Apr. 11, 1731.
 James (Negro man), June 24, 1733.
 Pito, „ „ June 24, 1733.
 Elizabeth, of above, June 24, 1733.
 Marea, of „ „ June 23, 1734.
 Sabina (free Negro woman), Mar. 16, 1735.

Ann, of Peter and Jane, Feb. 13, 1736[7
 Jane, of „ „ Apr. 29, 1739.
 Nancy, of „ „ Jan. 11, 1740[1
 Boston (Negro servt. to Col. Hutchinson), Nov. 13, 1737.
 Boston, of above, Nov. 13, 1737.
 Cesar, of „ „ Nov. 13, 1737.
 Peter, of Boston, Mar. 2, 1740.

NEESEN.

1691 Nov. 29. Willoughby.

NELLACUT.

1736 Apr. 4. Susanna.

NEWBAL.

1694 Mary.

NEWHAL(L).

1708 Nov. 21. S,
 1718 Mar. 16. Sarah.

Mary, of Rest., Dec. 16, 1694.
 Elizabeth, of „ „ Aug. 21, 1698.
 John, of „ „ Oct. 28, 1705.
 James, of „ „ Dec. 29, 1695.
 Abigail, of „ „ Apr. 26, 1702.
 Eleazar, of Ann, Nov. 28, 1714.
 Nathaniel, of „ „ Apr. 8, 1716.

NEWMAN.

1731 Sept. 26. Thomas.

NICHOLS, OR NICHOLS.

1797 Mary.

John, of Reb., Mar. 13, 1715.
 Abigail, of Abigail, Apr. 2, 1727.
 Andrew, of „ „ Jan. 26, 1728[9

NICHOLSON.

1686 June 20. Elizabeth.

NIPROD.

1714 Mar. 14. Sarah.

NOBLE.

Elizabeth, of „ „ June 15, 1712.
 John, of „ „ Jan. 24, 1713[4
 William, of „ „ July 13, 1718.

NORRIS.

Thomas, of Martha, Sept. 30, 1705.
 Mary, of „ „ Dec. 23, 1716.

NORTON.

1685 Mar. 1. David.
 1690 July 27. Mary.

1700 May 5. Experience.

William, of David
and Temperance, Dec. 20, 1691.
Thomas, of " " July 30, 1693.
John, of " " July 30, 1693.
Samuel, of " " Jan. 12, 1695[6
David, of " " Mar. 21, 1697.
Joanna, of " " July 9, 1699.
George, of George, Nov. 9, 1701.
Eunice, of David, Jan. 5, 1796[7
Jonathan, of " Nov. 6, 1709.
George, of " Aug. 1, 1703.
John, of " July 29, 1705.
Abigail, of " Aug. 3, 1707.
Samuel, of " Oct. 24, 1725.
William, of " Sept. 3, 1727.
David, of " Sept. 21, 1729.
Thomas, of " Jan. 31, 1730[1
John, of " Mar. 17, 1734.
Jonathan, of Sarah, Mar. 14, 1736.
Temperance, of " Feb. 26, 1737[8

NORVELL, or NORVIL.

John, of " May 26, 1706.
Mary, of Mary, Aug. 14, 1709.
Stephen, of " Oct. 5, 1712.
John, of John, Aug. 8, 1731.
John, of " Feb. 25, 1732[3
Mary, of " Feb. 15, 1735[6
Nathl., of " Jan. 23, 1736[7
George, of " July 10, 1737.
Francis, of " Sept. 3, 1738.
(See White, 1738-)

NOWEL(L).

Joseph, of Eliza, Sept. 16, 1711.
George, of " Sept. 16, 1711.
Michael, of " Sept. 16, 1711.
Thomas, of " Sept. 16, 1711.
Zechariah, of " Sept. 16, 1711.
John, of " Sept. 16, 1711.
Elizabeth, of " Sept. 16, 1711.
Lydia, of " Sept. 16, 1711.
Thomas, of John, Aug. 27, 1732.
Mary, of " Aug. 27, 1732.
Michael, of " Sept. 16, 1739.

NOYES.

John, of Susannah, Dec. 17, 1699.

NUTTAGE.

1770 Aug. 5. Sarah.

OAKES.

1710 May 21. Josiah.

Bethiah, of Samuel, Oct. 16, 1709.
Mary, of " Feb. 11, 1710[1
Edward, of " Jan. 11, 1712[3

ODEL.

Mehetabel, of Mar. 31, 1728.
Sarah, of above, Mar. 31, 1728.
Rignel, of " Mar. 31, 1728.
Samuel, of " Mar. 31, 1728.
John, of " Mar. 31, 1728.

OLIVER.

1678 Nov. 3. Susanna.
1681 July 10. John.
1700 Mar. 10. Hannah.
1710 May 21. Peter.
1740[1 Jan. 11. Sarah.

Jerusha, of Peter and
Jerusha (deceased), Dec. 31, 1710.
Susan'h, of Martha, May 27, 1711.
John, of " June 10, 1711.

ORNE.

1700 Mar. 10. Sara.

ORRIS.

1677 May 11. S.
1677[8 Feb. 17. S.
1690[1 Jan. Hanna.
1721 May 7. Abigail.

Elizabeth, of Hanna, Feb. 1, 1690[1
Hanna, of " Feb. 1, 1690[1
Joseph, of " Feb. 1, 1690[1

PACKER.

John, of Feb. 17, 1711[2

PAGE.

1681[2 S.
1716 June 3. Ruth.

William, of Dec. 27, 1713.
Edward, of Sept. 18, 1715.
John, of Aug. 4, 1717.
Abiel, of July 19, 1719.
John, of Oct. 1, 1721.
Jonathan, of July 29, 1723.
Mary, of July 18, 1725.
Gardner, of Mar. 12, 1727.
Benjamin, of Ruth, June 14, 1730.

PAIN, or PAYNE.

1692 Mar. 20. William.
1708 Mar. 28. Stephen.
1713 July 19. Hannah.
1715 Apr. 17. Mary.
1736[7 Jan. 9. Diana.
Prior to 1786. Mary.
" " " William.

Mehetabel and six children, viz. :
 Mary,
 Margaret,
 Elizabeth,
 Hannah,
 Mehetabel,
 John,
 William, of William }
 and Mary, Nov. 24, 1695.
 Tobiah, of William, June 27, 1697.
 Sarah, of William
 and Mary, July 16, 1699.
 John, of Bethiah, Sept. 13, 1702.
 Sarah, of ,, Sept. 13, 1702.
 Hannah, of ,, Oct. 22, 1704.
 Samuel, of July 6, 1707.
 Elizab., of Hannah, June 25, 1710.
 Sus'h, of Stephen, Dec. 10, 1710.
 Mary, of ,, Oct. 12, 1712.
 Richard, of ,, Aug. 19, 1716.
 Mary, of ,, Oct. 26, 1718.
 Samuel, of ,, Oct. 30, 1720.
 William, of June 1, 1712.
 Stephen, of Mar. 1, 1713.
 Hannah, of Mar. 14, 1714.
 Stephen, of Apr. 25, 1714.
 Sarah, of Oct. 9, 1715.
 Mary, of Oct. 5, 1718.

PAKE.
 Ruth, of May 4, 1712.

PALFRY.
 1727 Nov. 19. Hannah.
 Hannah, of Jan. 5, 1706[7
 Hannah, of Hannah, Feb. 9, 1706[7
 Richard, of Apr. 24, 1709.
 Lydia, of Sept. 3, 1710.
 Walter, of Oct. 28, 1711.

PALMER.
 1685 Dec. 27. Hannah.

PAR(R)HAM, or PARAM.
 Rebeckah, of Feb. 27, 1697[8
 Hannah, of Dec. 15, 1700.
 Joseph, of Oct. 22, 1704.
 Frances, of June 15, 1707.
 Mary, of Dec. 16, 1711.

PARKER.
 1769 Mar. 26. Susanna.
 Thomas, of Rachel, July 28, 1695.
 Elizabeth, of Dec. 30, 1716.
 Anna, of Jan. 5, 1717[8
 Elizabeth, of Sept. 11, 1720.

PARKMAN.
 1664 Dec. 11. S.
 1683 May 20. Eliza.
 1687[8 Jan. 1. Hannah.
 1725 Apr. 11. Susanna.
 1781 Dec. 31. Samuel.
 Prior to 1786. Sarah.

Elizabeth, of Sept. 14, 1690.
 Mary, of Hannah, Aug. 7, 1692.
 Rebeckah, of ,, Aug. 7, 1692.
 Susanna, of Sept. 11, 1692.
 John, of Jan. 21, 1693[4
 Samuel, of Nov. 24, 1695.
 Rebeckah, of June 7, 1696.
 Nathaniel, of June 12, 1698.
 Alexander, of May 28, 1699.
 Ebenezer, of Sept. 5, 1703.
 Hannah, of Feb. 4, 1710[1
 Sarah, of William, Nov. 16, 1712.

PARMITER.
 1682 June 5. S.

PARNAL, or PARNEL.
 Frances, of Dorothy, Oct. 1, 1693.
 Frizzel, of Francis, Aug. 7, 1720.

PAUL.
 Mary, of Matthew, Apr. 14, 1728.
 Sarah, of ,, Mar. 29, 1730.

PAWLY.
 1689 May 19. Mary.

PEAL.
 1721[2 Feb. 4. Susanna.

PEARSE, or PEIRCE, or PIERSE.
 1677 June 1. S.
 1694 Mar. 11. Robert.
 1705[6 Jan. 27. Isaac.
 1712 Oct. 26. Moses.
 1714 Dec. 26. Grace.
 1717[8 Feb. 9. Mary (bapt.).
 1734 Sept. 29. Elizabeth.
 1738 Mar. 19. Sarah.
 1738 Mar. 19. Elizab. (bapt.).

Thomas, of Reb., Apr. 6, 1701.
 Stephen, of Ra., June 15, 1701.
 Rachel, of ,, June 15, 1701.
 John, of July 13, 1701.
 Joseph, of Aug. 24, 1701.
 Agnes, of Mar. 14, 1703.
 Mary, of Apr. 18, 1703.
 Josiah, of May 27, 1705.
 Susannah, of Nov. 18, 1705.
 Isaac, of Isaac, Apr. 17, 1709.

Sarah, of Isaac, May 28, 1710.
 Elizab., of ,, Jan. 22, 1715.
 Samuel, of ,, Apr. 12, 1719.
 Isaac, of ,, Oct. 14, 1722.
 Isaac, of ,, Apr. 21, 1723.
 Mary, of ,, Mar. 7, 1725.
 Moses, of Moses, Nov. 9, 1712.
 Eliza, of ,, Nov. 9, 1712.
 John, of ,, Mar. 29, 1713.
 Lydia, of ,, Sept. 7, 1712.
 Sarah, of Nov. 15, 1713.
 Mary, of Dec. 13, 1713.
 Mary, of Dec. 16, 1716.
 Susannah, of Mar. 15, 1719.
 John, of Mar. 12, 1721.
 Jonathan, of July 23, 1721.
 Rebeckah, of Thos., Oct. 27, 1723.
 Thomas, of ,, July 18, 1725.
 Susanna, of ,, Nov. 26, 1727.
 John, of ,, Dec. 15, 1734.
 Joanna, of ,, May 29, 1737.
 Lydia, of June 18, 1727.
 John, of Jan. 6, 1733[4
 Mary, of John, Oct. 31, 1736.
 John, of ,, June 11, 1738.
 Abigail, of ,, May 18, 1740.

PEARLE.

Sarah, of Mary, Oct. 3, 1714.

PEARSON, or PIERSON.

1726 Nov. 13. Grace.
 Thomas, of July 19, 1696.
 Mary, of Sept. 25, 1698.
 Hammond, of Sept. 14, 1701.
 Abigail, of Sept. 23, 1705.

PEAT.

Joseph, of Jan. 26, 1717[8

PECK.

Ebenezer, of Joanna, May 10, 1696.
 Joanna, of ,, June 27, 1697.
 Joanna, of ,, Oct. 30, 1698.

PEGGY.

1697 Apr. 11. Dorcas.

PELIHAM.

1730 June 28. Rebecca.

John, of El., Sept. 3, 1693.
 Edward, of ,, Sept. 3, 1693.
 Samuel, of ,, Sept. 3, 1693.
 William, of ,, May 13, 1694.

PELL.

Elizabeth, of Dec. 12, 1697.

PELLOU.

Abigail, of Feb. 16, 1723[4
 Abraham, of above, Feb. 16, 1723[4
 Peter, of ,, Feb. 16, 1723[4
 Abigail, of ,, Feb. 16, 1723[4
 Thomas, of ,, Mar. 8, 1724.

PENNEL.

1677 July 29. S.
 1691 Apr. 19. Alice.

PERKINS.

1715 May 29. Keziah.
 1725 Sept. 12. John.
 1725 Oct. 10. Mary.

Isaac, of Mary, Mar. 5, 1704.
 Richard, of Sept. 16, 1705.
 Abraham, of Dec. 30, 1705.
 Mary, of Mar. 23, 1707.
 Checkley, of John, Mar. 30, 1707.
 Abraham, of ,, Sept. 5, 1714.
 Nathaniel, of ,, Nov. 6, 1715.
 Benjamin, of ,, Apr. 13, 1718.
 Hannah, of ,, Apr. 4, 1708.

PERRY.

1706[7 Jan. 26. William.
 1723 May 12. Sarah.

Sarah, of Susannah, Oct. 15, 1699.
 John, of Apr. 22, 1705.
 Mary, of William, Oct. 10, 1708.
 Bearnslly, of Jno., Apr. 30, 1710.

PERRYMAN.

1726 Nov. 13. Elizabeth.

PHELPS.

Elizabeth, of July 3, 1709.

PHILLIPS.

1650 June 5. John.
 1655 Nov. 9 to
 June 3, 1657. Widow.
 1658[9 Jan. 16. Jean.
 1675[6 Feb. 20. S.
 1682 25. Temperance.
 1687 May 22. Bridget.
 1794 Ann.
 1794 Sybella.
 Bridget, of July 26, 1691.
 Nathanael, of Jan. 14, 1693[4
 Zechariah, of Debor., Feb. 9, 1700[1
 Bridget, of ,, June 6, 1703.
 Rebeckah, of Nov. 7, 1703.
 Nathaniel, of Aug. 20, 1704.
 Thomas, of Feb. 25, 1704[5

Mary, of M., Sept. 5, 1714.
 Elizabeth, of,, Sept. 5, 1714.
 Sarah, of ,, Sept. 5, 1714.
 John, of ,, Sept. 5, 1714.

PHIPS.

1690 Mar. 8. Sr. William.

PICKMAN.

Joshua, of May 10, 1713.
 Nathanael, of Aug. 3, 1718.

PIERPONT.

1727[8 Feb. 11. Sarah.
 1732 Oct. 15. James.

PIKE, or PIEK.

Samuel, of Nov. 23, 1707.
 Phillip, of Mar. 27, 1709.
 Mary, of Oct. 21, 1711.
 Katharine, of Sus., May 8, 1720.
 William, of ,, June 19, 1720.
 Susannah, of Sept. 11, 1720.

PINDAR.

Eliza, of Benjamin, Aug. 8, 1736.

PINE.

Katharine, of Oct. 13, 1723.

PITCHER.

1690 July 13. Hanna.

John, of Hanna, July 13, 1690.
 Susanna, of ,, July 13, 1690.
 Hanna, of ,, July 13, 1690.
 Mary, of Grace, Dec. 14, 1712.
 Elizabeth, of June 12, 1715.
 John, of Aug. 30, 1719.

PITMAN.

Elizabeth, of Sept. 22, 1716.
 William, of July 13, 1718.
 William, of Apr. 10, 1720.

PITTS.

1682 Apr. 9. S.
 1709 Aug. 7. Hannah.

Elizabeth, of Eliz., Dec. 31, 1693.
 John, of ,, July 14, 1700.
 James, of ,, Dec. 19, 1703.
 Elizabeth, of ,, Aug. 14, 1709.
 John, of ,, Aug. 14, 1709.
 William, of ,, Aug. 14, 1709.
 Mary, of ,, Aug. 14, 1709.
 Hopestill, of ,, Aug. 17, 1712.
 Hannah, of ,, Aug. 17, 1712.
 Joseph, of ,, Mar. 8, 1713.

James, of July 26, 1696.
 William, of June 19, 1698.
 Mary, of June 3, 1705.
 Lydia, of July 13, 1707.
 Richard, of Hannah, Sept. 4, 1709.
 Edward, of Sept. 25, 1709.
 Joseph, of Dec. 31, 1710.
 Richard, of Apr. 4, 1714.
 Sarah, of Nov. 18, 1716.

PIT(T)SON.

Elizabeth, Sept. 18, 1715.
 James, of Mar. 9, 1718.

PLAISTED, or PLAISTEAD.

1727 Dec. 24. Mary.

Sarah, of July 23, 1699.
 John, of Mar. 30, 1701.
 Mary, of Nov. 1, 1702.
 Rebeckah, of Feb. 4, 1704[5
 Rebeckah, of Aug. 11, 1706.
 Elizabeth, of Feb. 29, 1707.
 John, of Sept. 23, 1711.
 Thomas, of Mar. 16, 1718.
 Abigail, of above, Mar. 16, 1718.
 Thomas, of ,, Mar. 16, 1718.
 Mary, of ,, Mar. 16, 1718.
 Elizabeth, of ,, Mar. 16, 1718.
 John, of ,, Mar. 16, 1718.
 Hannah, of June 28, 1719.
 Daniel, of Oct. 15, 1721.
 Thomas, of Aug. 1, 1725.

PLATTS.

Esther, of Hannah, Aug. 15, 1697.
 Hannah, of Feb. 5, 1698[9

PLIMLIE.

1708 Sept. 5. Mary.

POM(E)R(O)Y.

1719 Mar. 15. Joseph (bapt.).
 1725 Apr. 25. Lydia.
 1727[8 Jan. 14. Mary.
 1737 Mar. 27. Lydia.

John, of Nov. 23, 1712.
 Thomas, of Apr. 10, 1715.
 Lydia, of Sept. 1, 1717.
 Mary, of Aug. 19, 1722.
 Susanna, { twins of } Sept. 10, 1727.
 Elizabeth, { Lydia, }
 Samuel, of Lydia, Aug. 9, 1730.

PORTER.

Thomas, of Pru-
 dence, Sept. 1, 1706.
 Sarah, of Eliza, June 29, 1707.

William, of Aug. 1, 1708.
 Elizabeth, of June 11, 1710.
 James, of June 22, 1712.
 Jarid, of Feb. 28, 1713[4
 Charles, of Apr. 21, 1717.
 Hannah, of Apr. 21, 1717.
 Daniel, of Nov. 2, 1718.
 Aaron, of July 17, 1720.
 Elisha, of David
 and Eliza, Apr. 10, 1726.

POUSLIN, or POUSLY.

Samuel, of Samuel, Sept. 25, 1715.
 Elizabeth, of Nov. 24, 1717.
 Katharine, of Nov. 13, 1720.
 Mary, of Apr. 14, 1723.
 Elizabeth, of May 29, 1726.
 Hannah, of Aug. 11, 1728.
 Katharine, of Saml., Aug. 23, 1730.
 Margaret, of Mar-
 garet, Sept. 30, 1733.
 Samuel, of Abigail, July 23, 1738.
 Sarah, of „ July 20, 1740.

POWELL.

1650 June 5. Michael.
 1658[9 Jan. 16. S.

Thomas, of Dorothy, Mar. 21, 1703.

POWER.

Sarah, of July 30, 1738.

PRATT, or PRAT.

1682[3 Timothy.
 1714[5 Feb. 13. Mary.
 1717 Sept. 1. Ebenezer.
 1717 Sept. 1. Rachel.
 1725 Apr. 25. William.
 1725 Apr. 25. Mehetabel.
 1725 Aug. 22. Joshua.

Margaret, Mar. 4, 1694.
 Abigail, of May 24, 1696.
 Elizabeth, of Aug. 25, 1700.
 Elias, of May 2, 1703.
 Rachel, of Ebenezer, Mar. 23, 1712.
 Ebenezer, of „ Nov. 20, 1715.
 Joseph, Sept. 28, 1712.
 Mary, of Joseph, Sept. 28, 1712.
 John, of Oct. 4, 1713.
 Elizabeth, of Nov. 1, 1713.
 Hannah, of Oct. 30, 1715.
 Mary, of July 1, 1716.
 Elizabeth, of Jan. 6, 1716[7
 Caleb, of Dec. 22, 1717.
 Elizabeth, of May 22, 1720.
 Gill, of Mehetabel, Jan. 15, 1720[1
 William, of Apr. 21, 1723.

John, of William, Aug. 8, 1725.
 Mary, of William
 and Mehetabel, Sept. 14, 1729.
 Mehetabel, of Wm., May 14, 1732.
 Hannah, of „ May 4, 1735.

PRIEST.

1684 Jan. 18. Hannah.

PRINCE, or PRENCE.

1725 Mar. 28. David.
 1726 Mar. 6. Elizabeth.

Deborah, of Feb. 23, 1717[8
 Elizabeth, of Eliza, Apr. 5, 1719.
 David, of Apr. 2, 1721.
 David, of Sept. 29, 1723.
 James, of David, Apr. 11, 1725.
 Elizabeth, of David
 and Eliza, Apr. 23, 1727.

PRINGLE(E).

1688 June 3. Sarah.
 1721[2 Feb. 4. Sarah.

Alexander, of Sarah, May 1, 1692.
 Sarah, of „ Feb. 17, 1694[5
 Margaret, of „ Jan. 24, 1696[7
 Elizabeth, of „ Jan. 29, 1698[9
 Mary, of „ Jan. 29, 1698[9
 Elizab., } twins of }
 Mary, } Sarah, } Feb. 1, 1701[2

PRITCHET.

1723 Jan. 12. Sarah.

Sarah, of Sarah, June 5, 1720.
 Mary, of Aug. 5, 1722.

PROCTER(TOR).

1698 Dec. 25. Edward.
 1716 Sept. 22. Mary.
 1720 Mar. 20. Benjamin.
 1725 Mar. 14. John.
 1727 Dec. 10. Samuel.
 1727[8 Jan. 7. Mary.
 1727[8 Jan. 7. Margaret.
 1730 Aug. 16. Nathaniel.
 1768 Aug. 14. Judah.
 1772 April. Edward, jun.
 1783 May 31. Sarah.
 1795 Sarah.

Mary, of June 25, 1693.
 Joseph, of Feb. 24, 1694[5
 Thomas, of Dec. 27, 1696.
 Benjamin, of Ed., Feb. 12, 1698[9
 John, of „ Aug. 8, 1703.
 Timothy, of „ Jan. 12, 1706[7

Nathanael, of Ed., Oct. 2, 1709.
 Ebenezer, of „ Aug. 17, 1712.
 Elizabeth, of Edward
 and Eliza, Dec. 26, 1714.
 Elizabeth, of Sept. 21, 1701.
 Samuel, of June 17, 1705.
 Samuel, of Mar. 28, 1708.
 Mary, of Mar. 1, 1713.
 Benjamin, of Benj., Nov. 18, 1722.
 Elizabeth, of „ July 19, 1724.
 John, of „ Jan. 29, 1726[7
 Ephraim, of „ Oct. 13, 1728.
 Samuel, of Benjamin
 and Mary, Sept. 13, 1730.
 Elizabeth, of June 9, 1723.
 Mary, of Joseph, May 10, 1724.
 Rachel, of „ Apr. 11, 1725.
 Hannah, of „ Sept. 27, 1730.
 Joseph, of „ June 3, 1733.
 Hannah, of John, June 22, 1729.
 John, of „ Mar. 7, 1731.
 Edward, of „ Sept. 2, 1733.
 Joseph, of „ Sept. 14, 1735.
 Joseph, of „ July 10, 1737.
 Samuel, of „ Oct. 1, 1738.
 Elizabeth, of Nathl., July 30, 1738.

PROUTE.

1717 May 12. Josephe.

PULCIFER.

Freeman, of Joseph, Apr. 13, 1735.
 Joseph, of „ Feb. 13, 1736[7

PULLEN, or PULLING.

1714 Feb. 20. Mary.
 1772 May. Elizabeth.

PUR(R)INGTON.

1728 Nov. 10. Sarah.

Sarah, of Sarah, July 4, 1697.
 Hannah, of Sept. 15, 1700.
 Elias, of July 2, 1704.
 Sarah, of Apr. 7, 1706.
 John, of Aug. 29, 1708.
 Abigail, of Dec. 11, 1709.
 Abigail, of Dec. 2, 1711.
 Ann, of Feb. 6, 1714[5

PYM.

1702 May 17. John (bapt.).
 1702 June 28. Mary.

RADMORE.

John, of Mary, Feb. 13, 1703[4

RAINER, RAYMER, &c.

1727 Nov. 12. Elizabeth.

James, of Elizabeth, Oct. 1, 1693.
 Elizabeth, of Oct. 28, 1694.
 Sarah, of May 16, 1697.
 of Jan. 15, 1698[9
 Mary, of July 6, 1701.
 Susannah, of Sept. 3, 1704.
 James, of Mar. 16, 1707.
 Martha, of Sept. 24, 1710.
 Lydia, of Dec. 28, 1712.

RAINSFORD.

1670 S.
 1692 July 24. Susanna.
 1700 Mar. 10. Rebeckah.

John, of Rebeckah, May 19, 1695.
 Mercy, of „ May 18, 1695.
 John, of „ Jan. 26, 1700[1
 Rebeckah, of R., Mar. 10, 1706.

RAND.

1769 Dec. 29. Sarah.
 1795 Ann.

Robert, of Robert, Feb. 12, 1709[0
 Thomas, of June 3, 1711.
 Thomas, of Nov. 9, 1712.
 Elizabeth, of June 20, 1714.
 Rachel, of Mar. 4, 1716.
 Robert, of Jan. 19, 1717[8
 Joshua, of July 19, 1719.
 William, of Sept. 4, 1720.
 Sarah, of Mar. 25, 1722.
 William, of Robert, July 7, 1723.
 Mary, of Mar. 7, 1725.
 Joshua, of Feb. 12, 1726[7

RANDAL.

1714[5 Jan. 23. Elizabeth.

Joseph, of Eliza, July 25, 1714.
 Mary, of Sept. 19, 1714.
 Margaret, of Aug. 22, 1725.
 Sarah, of Sarah, Nov. 2, 1729.
 Abigail, of „ Mar. 1, 1730.
 Mary, of „ Jan. 12, 1734[5
 Stephen, of „ Dec. 5, 1736.

RANKIN.

1655 Nov. 9 to
 June 3, 1657 S.

RANOST.

Charles, of Apr. 21, 1723.

RASHLEY.

1692 Mar. 20. S. Christian.

RAWLINGS.
1670 S.
Love, of Love, July 31, 1709.
John, of „ Sept. 2, 1711.
Judith, of „ Oct. 10, 1714.

RAY.
Caleb, of Caleb, Feb. 9, 1706[7
George, of „ Feb. 9, 1706[7
George, of „ Nov. 6, 1709.

RA(Y)MOND, or REYMOND.
1768 Nov. 6. Thomas.
1774 May. Elizabeth.
Mary, of Mary, Apr. 23, 1727.

READ, &c.
1661 Aug. 4. Esdras.
1661 Aug. 4. S.
1667 Aug. 11. S.
1690 Apr. 14. Elizabeth.
1720 Sept. 25. Obadiah.
Esther, of Feb. 24, 1705[6
John, of Eliza, Jan. 5, 1706[7
Richard, of Aug. 29, 1708.
Samuel, of Apr. 3, 1709.
Sarah, of Sarah, May 13, 1711.
Hannah, of Hannah, June 24, 1711.
Elizabeth, of May 4, 1712.
Eliza, of Jan. 3, 1713[4
Susannah, of Sept. 29, 1717.
Mary, of Mary, May 15, 1726.
Venteman, of May 25, 1729.

REDDUCK.
Abiel, of Abiel, June 8, 1707.
John, of Jan. 9, 1708[9
John, of May 18, 1712.
John, of July 12, 1713.

REINOLDS, or RONALDS.
1706 Apr. 14. John.
1707 Nov. 9. Susanna.
1772 May. Grindal.
1772 Nov. 28. Benjamin.
John, of June 20, 1703.
John, of Mar. 30, 1720.

RENOFF, or RENUFFE.
John, of Oct. 24, 1725.
Rebecca, of Oct. 8, 1727.
Elizabeth, of Nov. 23, 1729.

RHODES.
1666 Apr. 29. S. [wife of
John].
1682[3 Theophilus.

RICHARDS.
1663[4 Feb. 7. John.
1670 Elizabeth.
1691 Oct. 4. Mehetabel.
1700 Nov. 24. Ann.
Humphrey, of Sus., Sept. 13, 1696.
John, of Nov. 21, 1697.
Susannah, of Jan. 26, 1700[1
Mary, of Sept. 19, 1703.
Obadiah, of Jan. 21, 1704[5
Samuel, of Dec. 23, 1711.
Sarah, of Mary, July 21, 1717.
Joanna, of Mar. 22, 1719.
Humphry, of Apr. 9, 1721.

RICHARDSON.
1791 Elizabeth.
Joseph, of Feb. 6, 1725[6
Ann, of May 5, 1728.
Isabella, of May 11, 1729.
John, of Jan. 10, 1730[1

RIDGAWAY.
James, of Mehetable, Jan. 9, 1725[6
Mehetabel, of „ Dec. 31, 1727.
John, of „ Mar. 15, 1730.
of „ June 27, 1731.
George, of Feb. 11, 1732[3
Joseph, of Mehetabel, Apr. 6, 1735.
Sarah, of „ Aug. 20, 1738.

RIX.
1708 Apr. 18. Mary.

ROBERTS.
1665[6 Jan. 14. S.
1741[2 Jan. 31. Ann.
John, of J., June 15, 1701.
Joseph, of „ June 15, 1701.
Mary, of „ June 15, 1701.
Sarah, of „ June 15, 1701.
Simon, of „ June 15, 1701.
Elizabeth, of „ June 15, 1701.

ROBERTSON, or ROBINSON.
1665[6 Jan. 14. Damaris.
1680 Nov. 7. George.
1681[2 Eliza.
1689 Oct. 6. Sara.
Joseph, of Sara, Sept. 21, 1690.

Nathanael, of George
and Eliz., Feb. 15, 1690[1
Robert, of " Jan. 29, 1692[3
Sarah, of " Feb. 11, 1693[4
Martha, of George, Jan. 12, 1695[6
of Aug. 14, 1692.
John, of Mary, Oct. 1, 1693.
Mary, of " Oct. 8, 1693.
Elizabeth, of Feb. 24, 1694[5
Edward, of Nov. 1, 1696.
James, of El., Apr. 13, 1701.
Edward, of " Apr. 13, 1701.
David, of Jan. 10, 1702[3
Elizabeth, of Apr. 28, 1706.

ROBES.

1682 June 5. Sarah.

ROBY, or ROBEE, or ROEBIE, or RUBY.

1681 Mar. 1. William.
1709 May 22. Thomas.
1716 May 13. Mary.
1720 Mar. 20. Lois.
1725 May 2. Joseph.
1790 Henry.
1790 Sarah.
1792 or 3 Joseph.

William, of William
and Elizabeth, Nov. 1, 1690.
John, of " " Dec. 6, 1691.
Joseph, of " " Aug. 20, 1693.
Samuel, of " " Nov. 4, 1694.
Dorothy, of " " Mar. 29, 1696.
Mercy, of " " } Sept. 19, 1697.
Anna, { twins. }
Sarah, of " " Dec. 11, 1698.
Ebenezer, of " " Oct. 5, 1701.
Henry, of " " Feb. 21, 1702[3
Mercy, of " " Sept. 3, 1704.
Elizabeth, of Elizab., Jan. 5, 1717[8
William, of Prisc., Jan. 17, 1719[0
William, of Feb. 12, 1720[1
James, of July 9, 1721.
Anna, of Feb. 16, 1723[4
Hannah, of Joseph, Jan. 16, 1725[6
William, of " June 11, 1727.
Ebenezer, of " June 30, 1728.
Thomas, of " Apr. 16, 1732.
William, of " Sept. 21, 1735.
John, of Jan. 30, 1725[6
James, of Dec. 31, 1727.
Sarah, of Mar. 23, 1729.

ROGERS.

1729 July 27. Elizabeth.
1730 June 28. George.
1742 Lydia.

Gamaliel, of Mercy, Mar. 11, 1711.
Mercy, of Sept. 6, 1713.
Henry, of May 29, 1715.
Elizabeth, of Aug. 5, 1716.
Mary, of Mercy, Feb. 2, 1717[8
William, of William, Aug. 24, 1718.
John, of Sept. 21, 1718.
Elizabeth, of June 14, 1719.
Elizabeth, of Sept. 18, 1720.
Sarah, of Jan. 8, 1720[1
Joseph, of Apr. 15, 1733.
Nathl., of George, Feb. 13, 1736[7
Sarah, of " Oct. 29, 1738.
Lydia, of " Sept. 20, 1741.
Elizabeth, of Mar. 19, 1738.

ROLASON.

Sarah, of July 24, 1715.
John, of Aug. 21, 1715.
John, of July 29, 1716.
Elizabeth, of Aug. 10, 1718.
Sarah, of Mar. 28, 1725.

ROLLS.

Mary, of Grace, Feb. 13, 1708[9

ROLSON, or ROLSTON.

Mary, of Aug. 1, 1708.
Susannah, } twins of Mar. 11, 1711.
Abigail, }
Joseph, of Nov. 23, 1712.

ROMNEY.

David, of Dec. 8, 1723.

ROSS.

1696 June 22. Rachel.
1726 May 29. William.

Rachel, of Feb. 24, 1694[5

ROWEL.

Samuel, of Thomas, May 20, 1705.
Sarah, of Mar. 2, 1707.
Hannah, of Apr. 17, 1709.
Rebeckah, of July 18, 1714.
Knight, of Dec. 30, 1716.

ROWNDES, or ROWNDEY.

Joseph, of Sarah, Sept. 10, 1699.
Samuel, of " Feb. 20, 1703[4

ROYCE.

1685[6 Jan. 31. Daniel.

RUCK.

1670 June 4. S.
1681 July 10. Eliza.
1681[2 Feb. 5. Samuel.

1690 May 25. John.
 1700 June 30. Hannah.
 1715[6 Feb. 19. Andrew.
 1722[3 Jan. 20. Hannah.
 1728 Mar. 10. Elizabeth.

Abigail, of John, Sept. 17, 1699.
 John, of „ Aug. 1701.
 Hannah, of John
 and Hannah, Dec. 6, 1702.
 John, of „ „ May 26, 1706.
 Peter, „ „ July 4, 1708.
 Eliza, „ „ Nov. 20, 1709.
 Margaret, „ „ Apr. 8, 1711.
 Mary, „ „ Sept. 21, 1712.

RUGGLES.

Sarah, of Tabitha, Aug. 26, 1705.
 John, of „ „ Aug. 26, 1705.
 Samuel, of „ „ Dec. 29, 1706.
 Robert, of „ „ Dec. 26, 1708.
 Robert, of „ „ May 18, 1712.

RUMLEY.

Elizabeth, of Feb. 25, 1721[2
 Thomas, of Aug. 1, 1725.
 Samuel, of Eliza, Aug. 27, 1727.
 Joseph, of Jan. 4, 1729[0
 Mary, of June 4, 1732.
 George, of Elizabeth, Mar. 3, 1734.
 Benjamin, of Sept. 14, 1735.
 Lydia, of Mar. 27, 1737.

RUSSEL.

1705[6 Feb. 24. Thomas.
 Mary, of Mary, Apr. 15, 1694.
 William, of Ann, June 8, 1701.
 Susannah, of June 24, 1705.
 Thomas, of Sept. 2, 1705.
 Ann, of Oct. 13, 1706.
 Ann, of July 11, 1708.
 Sarah, of Thomas, July 10, 1709.
 John, of Sarah, Dec. 6, 1730.

RUST.

Prior to 1786. Lucy.

RUTHER.

John, of Matthew, Sept. 22, 1706.

RYAL.

1708 Oct. 24. Mary.

Mary, of Mary, Apr. 25, 1703.
 John, of Feb. 4, 1704[5
 Joseph, of Nov. 10, 1706.

SABLES.

Lydia, of Jan. 26, 1717[8
 Mary, of Jan. 26, 1717[8

SALEE.

1785 Mary.

SALISBURY.

Nicho's, { twins of } Aug. 26, 1691.
 James, { Annabel, }
 Nicholas, of Bridget, Nov. 28, 1697.
 Benjamin, of Nov. 12, 1699.

SALMON.

1717[8 Feb. 16. Abiel.

William, of Abiel, Aug. 17, 1707.
 Mary, of „ „ Aug. 17, 1707.
 John, of „ „ Apr. 22, 1711.
 Sarah, of Sept. 27, 1713.

SALTER.

1690 May 25. Elizabeth.
 1713 Mar. 15. Richard.
 1714[5 Feb. 20. Abigail.
 1715 May 1. Sampson.

Sarah, of Abigail, Jan. 18, 1712[3
 Sarah, of Sampson, Mar. 25, 1716.
 Francis, of Abiel, Nov. 22, 1719.

SALTONSTALL.

1731 Dec. 26. Nathaniel, Esq.

SAMS.

1690 Apr. 14. Elizabeth.
 Elizabeth, of El., June 15, 1690.

SAMSON.

Benjamin, of Feb. 13, 1714[5

SANDS.

1693 May or June. Ann.

SARGENT, or SERGENT.

1731 Dec. 12. John.
 1735[6 Feb. 1. Mary.

John, of Dec. 12, 1731.
 Mary, of Mary, Feb. 8, 1735[6
 John, of John, July 9, 1738.
 Joseph, of John
 and Mary, July 6, 1740.

SATLEY.

Elnathan, of Jan. 6, 1711[2
 Martha, of Jan. 24, 1713[4

SAUSBERRY.
1782 Mar. 24. William.

SAVAGE.
Mercy, of Sarah, Oct. 21, 1716.
John, of Oct. 19, 1718.

SAVIL.
Sarah, of Jan. 23, 1714[5]

SCARLET.
1672 Oct. 20. Samuel.
1672 Oct. 20. S.

SCILY, or SEELY.
Abigail, of Sarah, Nov. 3, 1706.
Sarah, of „ Nov. 3, 1706.
John, of Oct. 25, 1713.

SCOLLY.
Lydia, of Lydia, Nov. 20, 1698.
Hannah, of „ Nov. 20, 1698.
John, of „ Nov. 20, 1698.
James, of „ Mar. 19, 1699.
Susannah, of Dec. 29, 1700.
Grover, of John, May 17, 1702.
Grover, of „ Oct. 15, 1704.

SCOT.
Rebecca, of Rebecca, Jan. 28, 1732[3]

SCOTTOW.
1693 June 10. Joshua.
1727 Dec. 10. Sarah.
Rebeckah, of Joshua
and Sarah, Jan. 30, 1697[8]
Sarah, of Joshua, Nov. 12, 1699.
John, of „ Nov. 16, 1701.

SCUTT.
Mary, of Sept. 9, 1716.
James, of Eliza, Jan. 25, 1718[9]

SEARCH.
1683 Apr. 15. S.

SEAVOUR.
1704 Oct. 1. Susanna.

SEECOME.
1696[7 Feb. 14. John.
Joseph, of June 16, 1706.
Mehetabel, of Feb. 22, 1707[8]
Symmons, of John, May 20, 1711.
Mary, of Nov. 6, 1715.

SEERS.
1714 July 11. Robert.
1714[5 Feb. 20. Elizabeth.

Robert, of Mar. 4, 1694.
Mary, of Robert, Mar. 4, 1694.
Robert, of „ Mar. 4, 1694.
Sarah, of „ Mar. 4, 1694.
Alexander, of „ May 29, 1698.

SENTAL.
1719 Nov. 1. Joanna.
1741 Sept. 6. Mary.
William, of Sept. 28, 1712.
John, of Mar. 31, 1717.
William, of Dec. 13, 1719.
Joseph, of June 2, 1723.

SENER.
1718 Apr. 13. Nathaniel.

SERVICE.
1724 Nov. 2. Joanna.
Samuel, of Joanna, Sept. 28, 1712.
James, of June 21, 1713.
John, of June 24, 1716.
David, of Aug. 24, 1718.

SEWARD.
1709 Nov. 6. Edyth.
1727 Dec. 10. Benjamin.
James, of Edyth, July 2, 1693.
William, of „ Oct. 6, 1695.
Thomas, of „ May 9, 1697.
John, of Jan. 15, 1698[9]
Samuel, of Edyth, Apr. 13, 1701.
Mary, of May 6, 1705.
Sarah, of May 6, 1705.
Benjamin, of Jan. 9, 1708[9]
Edward, of Benja., June 4, 1732.
Benjamin, of „ Aug. 14, 1737.
William, of „ June 7, 1741.
James, of James, July 28, 1734.

SEWELL.
Mary, of Oct. 1, 1710.

SEXTON.
1679 July 6. S.
John, of Mar. 13, 1692.

SHARP.
1700 Sept. 15. Mary.
1711[2 Feb. 24. Elizabeth.

1714 Dec. 26. Sarah.
 1716 June 3. Deborah.
 John, of John, Sept. 29, 1700.
 Elizabeth, of June 29, 1701.
 William, of Feb. 28, 1702[3
 Gibbons, of Feb. 28, 1702[3
 Mary, of Aug. 27, 1704.
 James, of Aug. 12, 1705.
 Abigail, of Mar. 2, 1707.
 Elizabeth, of Mar. 9, 1707.
 Sarah, of Mar. 20, 1709.
 Elizabeth, of Aug. 20, 1710.
 Jonathan, of Aug. 3, 1712.
 Gibbons, of Sarah, Jan. 9, 1714[5
 Mary, of Deborah, Jan. 9, 1714[5
 William, of Mar. 17, 1717.
 Mercy, of Sept. 20, 1719.
 Deborah, of Sept. 29, 1717.

SHARROW.

1735 Mar. 2. Mary.

SHAW.

1681 May 29. Ruth.
 1696 Aug. 23. Nathanael.

Ruth, of May 15, 1692.
 Susanna, of May 21, 1693.
 Joseph, of July 1, 1694.
 Margaret, of Nathl., May 14, 1699.

SHEPARD, or SHEPHERD.

Thomas, of Sept. 18, 1709.
 Elizabeth, of Mar. 2, 1712.
 William, of Feb. 7, 1713[4
 Mary, of Feb. 26, 1715[6
 Susannah, Dec. 28, 1718.

SHERBURN.

Thomas, of Margt., Feb. 1, 1710[1

SHERRARD.

Mary, of May 13, 1733.

SHERWIN.

Richard, of S., Feb. 19, 1698[9
 Jane, of „, Feb. 19, 1698[9
 Henry, of Sarah, Apr. 2, 1699.
 Thomas, of Dec. 22, 1700.

SHIPREEVE.

Hephziba, of Feb. 26, 1692[3
 Sarah, of El., Apr. 9, 1701.
 William, of Jan. 6, 1705[6
 Elizabeth, of Apr. 13, 1707.
 Mary, of July 30, 1710.

SHORS, or SHORE(S), or SHOORE.
 1700 Dec. 15. Mary (bapt.).

Elizabeth, of June 17, 1694.
 Susannah, of Mary, Dec. 22, 1700.
 John, of Dec. 6, 1702.

SHORT.

1692 July 24. Jane.
 1693[4 Jan. 21. Mercy.

SHORTRIGS.

1690[1 Feb. 21. Mary.
 Mary, and her infant, Feb. 21, 1690[1
 William, of Mary, June 26, 1692.

SHUTE.

1696 Nov. 8. Richard.

John, of Lydia, Apr. 12, 1702.
 Lydia, of „, Apr. 12, 1702.
 Elizabeth, of „, Apr. 12, 1702.
 Richard, of „, June 20, 1703.
 Michael, of „, Sept. 17, 1704.
 Michael, of Richard, Aug. 24, 1707.
 Mary, of „, Mar. 30, 1718.

SILL.

1706 Apr. 28. Thomas.
 Elizabeth, of June 21, 1702.
 Agnes, of Feb. 3, 1705[6

SIMKINS, or SYMKINS.

1724 Apr. 12. Margery.

Katharin, of Margt., Dec. 25, 1698.
 James, of Margery, Feb. 16, 1700[1
 Thomas, of June 6, 1703.
 William, of Margery, Oct. 22, 1704.

SIMPSON, or SYMPSON.

Elizabeth, of Apr. 20, 1701.
 Elizabeth, of Eliz., Sept. 19, 1703.
 Samuel, of Sept. 21, 1707.
 Abigail, of John, May 29, 1709.
 Jonathan, of Apr. 1, 1711.
 Benjamin, of Nov. 4, 1711.
 Wait, of Aug. 30, 1713.
 Wait, of Oct. 9, 1715.
 Austin, of Sept. 1, 1717.
 Hannah, of Dec. 22, 1717.
 John, of Lydia, Mar. 12, 1721.

SKATE(S).

1689 Mar. 24, or
 Apr. 7. Sara.

Joseph, of Hannah, July 13, 1701.
Hannah, of „, July 13, 1701.

SKIFF(E).

Margaret, of June 3, 1733.
Hannah, of Margt., June 3, 1733.
Ann, of „, June 3, 1733.
Rachel, of „, Aug. 4, 1734.
Mary, of „, Nov. 23, 1735.

SKILLINGS.

Prior to 1786. John.
1774 Jan. Prudence.

SKINNER, or SKYNNER.

1696 Nov. 8. Elizabeth.
1718 Dec. 28. Thomasin.
1725 May 2. John.

Mary, of Thomasin, July 22, 1694.
John, of „, July 22, 1694.
Elizabeth, of Eliza, Aug. 2, 1696.
Joseph, of Aug. 1, 1697.
John, of Oct. 9, 1698.
Joseph, of Apr. 13, 1701.
Sarah, of Oct. 3, 1703.
Woodes, of Aug. 3, 1712.
Sarah, of John, May 23, 1725.
of „, May 28, 1727.
Elizabeth, of „, July 28, 1728.

SKRIGGERS.

Sarah, of Sarah, Nov. 29, 1730.

SLAUTER.

Sarah, of Jan. 5, 1734[5]

SLEEPER.

1723 Nov. 10. Sarah.
John, of Oct. 12, 1718.

SMITH.

1677 July 10. S.
1677 July 29. S.
1681 Aug. 21. Mercey.
1692 Oct. 15. Deliverance.
1688 May 20. Jane.
1690 July 27. Mary.
1691 July to Sept. Eliza.
1701 Oct. 5. Esther.
1702 Sept. 20. Elizabeth.
1706 Apr. 14. Samuel.
1713 Mar. 22. Christian.
1718 Apr. 6. Ralph.
1718 May 11. John.
1724 July 5. Huldah.
1727 Apr. 2. Ann.

1727[8 Feb. 27. Sarah.
1728 Aug. 25. Sarah.

John, of Jane, Jan. 26, 1689[0
Margaret, of „, Feb. 3, 1694[5
Jane, of „, Mar. 6, 1697.
David, of „, Aug. 20, 1699.
Elizabeth, of „, Sept. 7, 1701.
Elizabeth, of „, Nov. 7, 1703.
Rachel, of „ (?) July 22, 1705.
Sarah, of „ (?) May 11, 1707.
Mary, of El., Nov. 29, 1691.
James, of „, Oct. 19, 1701.

(See Williams.)

Rebeckah, of Rebec-

kah, July 22, 1694.
Elizabeth, of „, Jan. 26, 1695[6
Grace, of Jeremy, May 17, 1702.
Samuel, of Samuel, Sept. 8, 1706.
Sarah, of Christian, Aug. 10, 1707.
John, of John, Jan. 22, 1715[6
William, of „, Jan. 22, 1715[6
Nathanael, of „, May 25, 1718.
Ruth, of „, June 12, 1726.
Mary, of „, Mar. 8, 1719.
Josiah, of Oct. 2, 1720.
Nathaniel, of Oct. 28, 1722.
Henry, of Ralph, Oct. 21, 1722.
John, of Ralph
and Huldah, Feb. 28, 1724[5
Thomas, of Ralph, Feb. 12, 1726[7
Huldah, of Ralph
and Huldah, Sept. 29, 1728.
Henry, of „ „, Aug. 30, 1730.
Buchanan, of Ralph, May 28, 1732.
Ralph, of „, Feb. 24, 1733[4]

SNELLING.

1677 Apr. 28. S. [W. of John?]
1725 May 9. Benja.

Jane, of Dec. 3, 1693.
John, of John and Jane, Dec. 3, 1693.
Sarah, of „ „, Dec. 3, 1693.
Abra'm, of „ „, Dec. 3, 1693.
Joseph, of Apr. 21, 1695.
Jane, of Nov. 10, 1695.
Abigail, of Feb. 13, 1697[8
Rebeckah, of Mar. 12, 1699.
Isaac, of Jan. 7, 1699[0
John, of July 27, 1701.
Robert, of Jan. 16, 1703[4
Josiah, of May 12, 1706.
Sarah, of Apr. 11, 1708.
Elizabeth, of Margt., Sept. 17, 1710.
Elizabeth, of „, Nov. 9, 1712.
Margaret, of „, May 21, 1715.
James, of Jan. 14, 1710[1

Nathaniel, of Dec. 28, 1712.
 Mary, of Nov. 13, 1715.
 Mary, of Nov. 9, 1718.
 Joseph, of Mar. 13, 1720.

SOMER.
 1717 Apr. 7. Mary.

SOTER.
 1770 Nov. 4. Mary.

SOUTER, or SOWTER, or SOUTHER.

1681 Mar. 1. Joseph.
 1700 Apr. 21. Daniel.
 Elizabeth, of Feb. 16, 1695[6
 Lois, of Feb. 16, 1695[6
 Eunice, of Feb. 16, 1695[6
 Joseph, of Feb. 16, 1695[6
 John, of Feb. 16, 1695[6
 Nathanael, of Mar. 29, 1696.
 Elizabeth, of Eliz., Oct. 23, 1698.
 Chris., of Chris., Aug. 5, 1711.
 Hannah, of Oct. 4, 1713.
 Mary, of Apr. 8, 1716.
 Mary, of Jan. 26, 1717[8
 Charles, of Apr. 19, 1719.
 Ann, of July 2, 1721.
 Nathaniel, of Dec. 16, 1722.
 Deborah, of Nov. 3, 1723.
 John, of Nov. 24, 1723.
 Joseph, { twins of }
 Mary, { Nathl, } Oct. 11, 1721.
 Sarah, of Apr. 3, 1726.
 Mary, of Christopher, July 2, 1727.
 Elizabeth, of Mary, June 29, 1729.

SPENCER, or SPINCER.
 John, of Aug. 8, 1703.
 Elizabeth, of Apr. 15, 1705.
 Nicholas, of Mary, May 16, 1708.
 Mary, of „ July 11, 1708.
 William, of Oct. 8, 1710.
 Constantine, of Aug. 1, 1711.
 Constantine, of B. Mar. 24, 1717.

SPRAGUE.
 Lydia, of Nov. 6, 1709.

SPRY.
 1690 May 4. S. Purchase.
 1691 July 12. Henry.
 Purch., of Purchase, Mar. 22, 1691.
 Ryall, of Henry and
 Purchase, Feb. 26, 1692[3
 Phinehas, of Dec. 16, 1694.
 Mehetabel, of July 12, 1696.

SQUIRE.
 Sarah, of Sarah, June 25, 1704.
 Sarah, { twins of
 Elizab., { July 15, 1705.

SQUIM.
 Margaret, of Sept. 8, 1706.

STACY.
 1719 May 10. Benjamin.
 1725 May 9. Remember.

Sus'h, of Remember, Oct. 24, 1703.
 Peter, of „ Sept. 9, 1705.
 Peter, of „ Feb. 16, 1706[7
 Mary, of Nov. 6, 1709.
 John, of Jan. 26, 1717[8
 Sus'h, of Abigail, Apr. 16, 1721.
 Thomas, of June 23, 1723.

STANBRIDGE.
 1719 Nov. 22. Sarah.

STANLEY.
 1721 June 4. Martha.

SIANNY, or STANEY.
 1742 Mary.

Richard, of Mary, Nov. 11, 1722.
 Mary, of Apr. 28, 1723.
 Elizabeth, of Mary, Jan. 15, 1726[7
 Joseph, of „ Jan. 26, 1728[9
 Katharine, of „ Apr. 11, 1731.

STANTON.
 1727 Dec. 24. Katherin.

STAR.
 1668 Oct. 8. [Martha.]

STARKEY.
 Thomas, of Eliz., Apr. 25, 1697.
 Robert, of „ Apr. 25, 1697.

STEARNS.
 1742 Sarah.

STEDMAN.
 1699 May 28. Hannah.

STEVENS.
 1659 Dec. 4. Sarah.
 1692 Apr. 3. Sara.
 1731 Nov. 21. Robert.
 1738[9 Feb. 25. Gammon.

Sarah, of Sarah, Apr. 3, 1692.
 Hannah, of „ Apr. 3, 1692.

Elizabeth, of Eliz., June 25, 1693.
 John, of Grace, July 19, 1696.
 Elizab., of „ Mar. 24, 1700.
 Mary, of „ Mar. 24, 1700.
 Grace, of John and
 Grace, Dec. 20, 1702.
 Susannah, of „ „ Jan. 16, 1703[4
 Gammon, of „ „ July 2, 1710.
 John, of Mary. Oct. 6, 1700.
 David, of „ Oct. 6, 1700.
 Abigail, of „ Oct. 6, 1700.
 Elizab., of „ Oct. 6, 1700.
 Mary, of „ Oct. 6, 1700.
 Hannah, of Oct. 14, 1705.
 Susannah, of Feb. 2, 1706[7
 Persis, of Erasmus, Oct. 24, 1708.
 Samuel, of „ Dec. 18, 1709.
 Persis, of „ Nov. 25, 1711.
 Erasmus, of „ Sept. 6, 1713.
 Roben, of Feb. 28, 1713[4
 Eliza. of Jan. 10, 1719[0

STIRLING.

William, of May 27, 1722.

STODDARD.

1691 June or July. Elizabeth.
 1727[8 Jan. 7. Tabitha.
 1741 Dec. 27. Thomas.

Children of Eliza, June 14, 1691.
 Elizabeth, of June 17, 1694.
 Thomas, of July 16, 1699.
 Bartholomew, of Apr. 12, 1702.
 Sarah, of Mar. 26, 1704.
 Arthur, of June 8, 1707.
 Nathl., of Tabitha, Apr. 26, 1724.
 Elizabeth, of „ July 25, 1725.
 Susannah, of „ Aug. 27, 1727.
 Thomas, of „ July 13, 1729.
 Tabitha, of „ Sept. 20, 1730.
 Sarah, of Thomas, Aug. 20, 1732.
 Elizabeth, of Mercy, Sept. 30, 1733.
 Patience, of Feb. 24, 1733[4
 Jno. Bently, of Mercy, June 19, 1737.

STONE.

1677 Nov. 4. Daniel.
 1701 May 4. Mary.
 Josiah, of Mary, Feb. 14, 1696[7
 William, of „ Mar. 12, 1699.
 Benjamin, of Josiah
 and Mary, Dec. 7, 1701.
 Abigail, of Feb. 3, 1705[6
 Mary, of Sept. 16, 1722.
 Ruth, of Luke, Sept. 19, 1725.
 Benja., of „ June 11, 1732.
 William, of „ Jan. 19, 1734[5

Margt., of Margaret, Apr. 30, 1727.
 Margaret, of „ Dec. 29, 1728.
 Abigail, of Oct. 25, 1730.
 Elizab., of Margaret, May 20, 1739.

STORER, or STOVER.

Dorothy, of Oct. 24, 1697.
 Dorothy, of Mar. 26, 1699.
 Nathaniel, of Margt., Dec. 28, 1712.
 Susannah, of Sus., Aug. 8, 1714.
 John, of „ Oct. 17, 1714.
 Benjamin, of July 8, 1716.
 Margaret, of Jan. 12, 1717[8
 Ruth, of Feb. 7, 1719[0
 Priscilla, of June 12, 1720.
 James, of Jan. 21, 1721.
 Mary, of Apr. 23, 1721.
 Samuel, of Dec. 9, 1722.
 Jonathan, of Feb. 13, 1725[6
 Joseph, of Nov. 13, 1726.
 Howard, of Sarah, Dec. 29, 1728.
 Abraham, of Nov. 30, 1729.
 Isaac, of Jan. 28, 1732[3

STORY, or STORIE.

Jane, of July 8, 1716.
 Josiah, of Mary, May 28, 1721.

STRANGE.

Sarah, of Apr. 12, 1702.

STRATTON, or STRETTON.

1725 May 2. Ann.
 1725 June 6. Bridget.

William, of El., Jan. 15, 1698[9
 Ruth, of Mary, July 26, 1702.
 Mary, of Margt., Oct. 11, 1702.
 Margaret, of Oct. 7, 1705.
 Elizabeth, of Sept. 6, 1719.
 Sebian, of Feb. 19, 1720[1

STRIDE.

1688 June 17. Elizabeth.
 1722 Apr. 15. John.

Samuel, of Mar. 2, 1690.
 Hannah, of Jan. 15, 1692[3
 Samuel, of May 17, 1696.
 John, of Jane, July 29, 1716.
 John, of „ Aug. 18, 1717.
 Elizabeth, of „ Mar. 6, 1720.

STRONG.

Lydia, of May 14, 1710.
 Mary, of May 14, 1710.
 John, of Nov. 23, 1712.
 James, of May 8, 1715.

STUDSON, or STUTSON.

Susannah, of Dec. 26, 1697.
 James, of Sept. 17, 1699.
 Lydia, of Jan. 4, 1701[2
 William, of Apr. 30, 1704.
 John, of Dec. 22, 1706.

STYLES.

Mary, of Jan. 15, 1698[9

SUMMERS.

1718 Apr. 13. William.

SUMNER.

1665 May 14. S.
 1665 July 2. William.
 1675 Aug. 8. William.
 1683 July 15. Hannah.
 1718 Oct. 26. Clement.
 1718 Oct. 26. Margaret.

William, of Clem., July 15, 1711.
 Margaret, of „ July 15, 1711.
 Elizabeth, of „ July 15, 1711.
 Samuel, of „ July 15, 1711.
 Benjamin, of „ July 15, 1711.
 Ebenezer, of „ Nov. 9, 1712.
 Benjamin, of Sept. 8, 1734.
 Abigail, of Abigail, Mar. 16, 1735.
 (belonging to the Church in Charlestown.)
 Abigail, of „ Aug. 29, 1736.
 Samuel, of Samuel, July 30, 1738.
 Samuel, of Abigail, Nov. 4, 1739.
 Daniel, of June 6, 1736.
 Mercy, of Mercy
 (Melvil), Apr. 25, 1736.

SUNDERLAND.

1670 B.

Mary, of John and
 Mary, Feb. 4, 1693[4
 Elizabeth, of John, Feb. 9, 1695[6
 Hannah, of May 22, 1698.
 Nathaniel, of John
 and Mary, June 18, 1699.
 Sarah, of July 21, 1700.
 Edward, of Nov. 7, 1703.
 Nathaniel, of John, Nov. 12, 1704.
 Hannah, of May 11, 1707.

SWAEN, or SWAYN.

1733 Mar. 4. Benjamin.
 1733 Mar. 4. Susannah.
 Benjamin, of Benj., June 11, 1704.
 Susanna, of Benj.
 and Susan, Jan. 4, 1729[0

SWASEY.

Samuel, of July 5, 1713.

SWETLAND.

1709 May 22. Benjamin.
 1709[0 Feb. 19. Hannah.

SYMONDS.

1693 Nov. 12. Hanna.

TALBOT.

1687 Apr. 10. Christopher.

TAYLER.

Sarah, of June 22, 1718.
 Joanna, of Mar. 19, 1721.

TEAGUE (?), or TEAYNE.

Sarah, of Sarah, June 16, 1723.
 Lydia, of June 6, 1725.

TEMPLE.

Sr. Thomas, June 4, 1670.

THA(T)CHER.

1691 Nov. 1. Mary.
 1696 May 10. Ann.
 1698[9 Jan. 29. Judah.
 1703 Sept. 26. Mary.

THOMAS.

1706 Apr. 28. William.
 1714[5 Feb. 13. Mercy.
 1728 Mar. 10. Joanna.
 1741 Sept. 6. Silence.

Elizabeth, of Eliz., May 21, 1693.
 Mercy, of „ May 21, 1693.
 Ann, of „ June 30, 1695.
 Abigail, of Abigail, Sept. 27, 1702.
 William, of William, Jan. 26, 1706[7
 Margaret, of Wm.
 and Abigail, Mar. 6, 1709.
 William, of „ „ Aug. 31, 1718.
 Ann, of „ „ June 19, 1720.
 Ann, of „ „ Oct. 29, 1721.
 James, of Joanna, Oct. 9, 1720.
 English, of Jan. 6, 1722[3
 Love, of Mar. 20, 1726.
 George, of July 13, 1729.

THOMSON, or THOMPSON.

1725 Aug. 1. Susanna.

Susannah, of Sus., Aug. 21, 1720.
 Thomas, of „ Sept. 5, 1725.
 Benjamin, of Benj., Oct. 21, 1725.
 Benjamin, of „ July 23, 1727.

Elizabeth, of Susanna, Mar. 2, 1729.
Joseph, of Benjamin, June 22, 1729.

THORNTON.

1677 Mar. 23. B.
1679 Sept. 14. S.
1698 Oct. 1. Timothy.
1737 Mar. 27. Elizabeth.

Experience, of Feb. 5, 1692[3
Timothy, of Eliza, Apr. 7, 1717.
Danforth, of Mar. 1, 1719.
Samuel, of Mar. 26, 1721.
Elizabeth, of Eliza, Mar. 10, 1723.
Experience, of „ Feb. 7, 1724[5
Timothy, of „ Feb. 5, 1726[7
Lydia, of „ Sept. 8, 1728.
Ebenezer, of Nov. 2, 1729.
Gilbert, of Eliza, May 28, 1732.
Lydia, of „ Mar. 19, 1738.

THWING.

1713 Mar. 22. Benjamin.
1739 Nov. 18. Hannah.
1741 Dec. 20. Bathsheba.
1741[2 Jan. 17. Bathsheba, jun.

John, of Benjamin, June 21, 1713.
John of „ May 8, 1715.
William, of „ Aug. 2, 1724.
Bathsheba, of „ Jan. 23, 1725[6
William, of „ May 21, 1727.
Benjamin, of Nov. 4, 1711.
Elizabeth, of Wm., July 31, 1715.
William, of Nov. 25, 1716.
Rebeckah, of July 28, 1717.
Mary, of Mar. 16, 1718.
Thomas, of Apr. 26, 1719.
Joseph, of July 31, 1720.
Hannah, of Dec. 3, 1721.
Bathsheba, of Apr. 14, 1723.
Benjamin, of Hannah, Dec. 9, 1739.

TILESTONE.

James, of May 21, 1704.
John, of Jan. 13, 1705[6
Mary, of Dec. 26, 1708.
Joseph, of Aug. 19, 1711.

TILY, or TYLY.

1719 Oct. 25. Elizabeth.

TINNY.

1701[2 Feb. 8. Hannah.
Elizabeth, of Eliza, Nov. 8, 1719.
John, of Dec. 8, 1723.

Sarah, of Sept. 5, 1725.
Lydia, of Eliza, Aug. 13, 1727.

TIPPER.

1696 Nov. 8. Mary.

TIRRINGTON.

Margaret, of Jan. 21, 1727[8

TITCOMB.

Mary, of Kath., Oct. 9, 1709.

TOLMAN.

Abigail, of Oct. 13, 1717.

TOOKER.

Joseph, of June 26, 1720.

TORREY.

1692 Apr. 17. John.

TOUR.

1673 Dec. 6. S.

TOUT, or TREAT, or TROUT.

1688[9 Feb. 17. Hannah.
1680 Oct. 27. Benjamin.
1715[6 Jan. 22. Mary.
1731[2 Jan. 23. Joseph.
Joseph, of Hanna, Dec. 14, 1690.
John, of „ Apr. 10, 1692.
Elizabeth, of „ Feb. 4, 1693[4
Elizabeth, of Benj., May 15, 1692.
Mary, of „ Apr. 28, 1695.
Mercy, of „ May 9, 1697.
Benjamin, of „ Mar. 3, 1700.
Richard, of „ Apr. 25, 1703.
Mary, of Mary, May 9, 1714.
Abigail, of Mar. 11, 1716.
Joseph, of Oct. 23, 1720.
William, of Feb. 3, 1722[3
Mary, of Mercy, Aug. 2, 1724.
Thomas, of July 16, 1727.
Joseph, of Sept. 24, 1727.
William, of Mary, Dec. 22, 1728.
Joshua, of Joseph, Sept. 28, 1729.
Joseph, of Joseph and Mary, Jan. 23, 1731[2
Thomas, of Mary, Apr. 22, 1733.
of Mar. 24, 1734.
Samuel, of Joseph, July 20, 1735.

TOWNSEND.

1681 Sept. 18. Samuel.
1681 Sept. 18. Elizabeth.
1681 Oct. 30. Thomas.
1681 Oct. 30. Mary.
1683 July 29. Abigail.

1689 Mar. 24. Samuel.
 1691 Mar. 15. Dorothy.
 1694 June 10. Ann.
 1694 Judith.
 1694[5 Feb. 10. Susanna.
 1696 Aug. 23. Solomon.
 1702 June 28. Hannah.
 1702[3 Jan. 30. Elias.
 1703[4 Jan. 23. Thomas.
 1704 Aug. 6. Rebeckah.
 1705 July 22. Isaac.
 1706 June 9. Alice.
 1716 Oct. 30. David.
 1716 Oct. 30. Mabel.
 1718 Mar. 16. Elizabeth.
 1727 Dec. 10. Elizabeth.
 1732 Nov. 12. Thomas.
 1737 Mar. 27. Sarah.
 1791 Abigail.

Mary, of James, Feb. 24, 1694[5
 Ruth, of „ Dec. 28, 1712.
 Patience, of „ Jan. 29, 1715[6
 Judith, of Judith, Jan. 17, 1696[7
 Mary, of Solomon, Apr. 2, 1699.
 Solomon, of „ Oct. 28, 1705.
 Jeremiah, of „ Apr. 25, 1708.
 Isaac, of Isaac, July 29, 1705.
 Ebenezer, of „ Aug. 7, 1709.
 Jeremiah, of „ Nov. 18, 1711.
 Anna, of „ July 4, 1714.
 Ebenezer, of „ June 24, 1716.
 Solomon, of Saml., Aug. 24, 1707.
 Samuel, of Thomas, Mar. 13, 1709.
 Samuel, of „ Feb. 10, 1711[2
 Martha, of „ Dec. 13, 1713.
 Thomas, of „ Aug. 7, 1715.
 Hannah, of „ July 17, 1720.
 John, of „ Sept. 23, 1722.
 Thomas, of Thomas

and Sarah, June 19, 1737.
 John, of „ „ May 14, 1738.
 Elizabeth, of „ Sept. 13, 1724.
 Elizabeth, of Eliza, Oct. 11, 1724.
 Hannah, of „ Nov. 10, 1695.
 James, of „ Apr. 18, 1697.
 Jonathan, of „ Apr. 3, 1698.
 Agnes, of „ June 26, 1698.
 David, of „ July 2, 1699.
 Joshua, of „ Mar. 16, 1701.
 Peter, of „ Mar. 30, 1701.
 Elisha, of „ Dec. 27, 1702.
 Thomas, of „ Jan. 9, 1703[4
 Elizabeth, of „ May 13, 1704.
 Lydia, of „ May 21, 1704.
 Alice, of „ Oct. 29, 1704.
 Rebeckah, of „ Apr. 1, 1705.
 Andrew, of „ Nov. 18, 1705.
 William, of „ Dec. 23, 1705.

Ebenezer, of Jan. 6, 1705[6
 Sarah, of „ Aug. 25, 1706.
 (of Malden)
 Susannah, of Sept. 22, 1706.
 Elizabeth, of Apr. 13, 1707.
 Davis, of July 18, 1708.
 Priscilla, of July 25, 1708.
 Lydia, of Feb. 6, 1708[9
 Abraham, of Apr. 16, 1710.
 James, of Apr. 23, 1710.
 Elias, of Elias, Oct. 29, 1710.
 Nathanael, of July 13, 1711.
 Rachel, of July 18, 1714.
 Mary, of May 27, 1716.
 Abram, of Apr. 27, 1718.
 David, of Feb. 10, 1722[3
 Ann, of Oct. 30, 1726.

TREAK.

1672[3 Feb. 12. S.

TREVIS.

1655 Nov. 9, to
 June 3, 1657. S.
 1670 or 1671. Samuel.

TREWORTHY.

Samuel, of Mary, Aug. 21, 1698.

TROW.

1681 Mar. 1. Mary.

Ebenezer, of Mary, July 17, 1692.
 Hannah, of „ Oct. 11, 1696.

TUCKER.

1691[2 Feb. 14. Mary.
 1710 Mar. 19. Richard.
 1710 Mar. 19. S.

of Mary, Dec. 18, 1692.
 Susannah, of „ Jan. 27, 1694[5
 Daniel, of „ Oct. 12, 1707.
 John, of „ Oct. 2, 1709.
 Bethiah, of Richard, Oct. 28, 1711.
 Mary, of „ Nov. 23, 1712.
 Noah, of above, Nov. 23, 1712.
 John, of „ Nov. 23, 1712.
 Joseph, of „ Aug. 22, 1714.
 Noah, of „ Feb. 2, 1723[4
 Mary, of Margaret, June 13, 1725.

TUDOR.

Prior to 1786. John.

TUEL.

Alice, of July 9, 1693.
 Baruard, of May 14, 1721.

TUFTON.

John, of Susannah, May 3, 1713.
 Robert, of „ June 10, 1716.
 Thomas, of „ June 15, 1718.

TURE(L)L, or TURILL, or TURYL.

1664 Dec. 11. S.
 1672 Sept. 7. Daniel.
 1684[5 Jan. 18. Samuel.
 1715[6 Jan. 15. Joanna.
 1727[8 Jan. 28. Joseph.

Daniel, of Daniel, Apr. 30, 1693.
 Joseph, of „ Apr. 30, 1693.
 John, of „ Apr. 30, 1693.
 Humphrey, of Daniel, Sept. 28, 1696.
 Samuel, of Samuel, Nov. 5, 1693.
 Mary, of „ Jan. 26, 1695[6
 Samuel, of „ Apr. 9, 1699.
 Ebenezer, of „ Feb. 8, 1701[2
 Anna, of Joanna, Sept. 14, 1718.
 Mary, of „ Apr. 24, 1720.
 Samuel, of Joanna, Mar. 15, 1724.
 Joseph, of „ Mar. 7, 1725.
 Joanna, of „ June 19, 1726.
 Mary, of „ Oct. 22, 1727.
 Daniel, of Joseph
 and Joanna, Sept. 22, 1728.
 Sarah, of „ „ Aug. 23, 1730.
 John, of „ „ Aug. 22, 1731.
 Ebenezer, of Jos., Mar. 2, 1735.

TYHURST.

Mary, of Mary, Feb. 11, 1704[5
 Elizabeth, of „ Apr. 14, 1706.

TYLER.

1735 June 22. Thomas.

John, of Deborah, Aug. 18, 1700.
 Moses, of „ July 26, 1702.
 John, of „ Oct. 8, 1704.
 Mary, of Thomas, Feb. 27, 1736[7
 Sarah, of „ Nov. 19, 1738.
 Lucy, of „ Sept. 14, 1740.

UNDERWOOD.

1690 July 13. Elizabeth.

Anthony, of Eliza., July 13, 1690.
 Israel, of „ July 27, 1690.
 William, of „ Nov. 8, 1691.
 John, of „ Aug. 13, 1704.
 Israel, of „ July 21, 1706.
 Elizabeth, of „ Jan. 29, 1709[0
 John, of John, Oct. 3, 1734.
 Elizabeth, of „ Oct. 12, 1735.
 Jane, of „ May 8, 1737.

John, of John, Feb. 11, 1738[9
 Anthony, of „ July 12, 1741.

UPSCAL.

1658 May 9. Susannah.

URAN.

1719 Sarah.
 1780 Hannah.

John, of „ Aug. 24, 1718.
 Sarah, of „ Aug. 24, 1718.
 Joseph, of „ Aug. 24, 1718.
 William, of „ Aug. 23, 1719.
 William, of „ Sept. 4, 1720.

VALE.

Mary, of C., July 9, 1693.
 Edward, of Chris-
 topher, Apr. 7, 1695.
 Christopher, of „ Mar. 20, 1698.
 John, of „ Mar. 19, 1699.

VARNEY, or VERNEY.

1664[5 Jan. 8. Thomas.
 1694 Mary.

John, of James, Sept. 26, 1703.
 Pool, of „ Jan. 14, 1710[1
 Jane, of „ Feb. 28, 1713[4
 James, of „ Aug. 11, 1706.
 Lydia, of Sarah, Aug. 17, 1707.
 Mary, of „ Oct. 2, 1709.
 Thomas, of „ Oct. 22, 1710.
 Benjamin, of „ Jan. 4, 1712[3
 Thomas, of „ Sept. 26, 1714.
 John, of „ Mar. 17, 1717.
 John, of „ July 4, 1708.
 Bethesdah, of „ Oct. 23, 1709.
 Mary, of „ Jan. 20, 1711[2

VAUGHAN.

1686 Dec. 5. S.

son of Mary, Dec. 8, 1689.
 John, of „ Apr. 10, 1692.
 Lydia, „ Mar. 4, 1694.
 Abigail, „ Mar. 8, 1696.
 Elizabeth, of „ July 31, 1698.
 Samuel, of „ Nov. 3, 1700.

VEERIN, or VERIN.

Mary, of P., Apr. 16, 1693.
 Mehetable, of „ Apr. 16, 1693.
 Penelope, of „ Apr. 16, 1693.
 Thomas, of H., Aug. 18, 1695.
 Hannah, of „ Aug. 18, 1695.
 Mary, of „ Aug. 18, 1695.
 Rebeckah, of „ Jan. 19, 1695[6

Abigail, of Feb. 20, 1697[8
 Mercy, of Jan. 5, 1700[1
 Elizabeth, of Apr. 23, 1704.
 Mary, of Mar. 19, 1721.

VENTEMAN.

Elizabeth, of Eliza, Jan. 9, 1703[4
 Mary, of July 14, 1706.

VERNON.

William, of Jane, June 29, 1740.

VIAL, or VIOL.

1682 Apr. 9. John.
 1682 June 5. S.

John, of M., Aug. 2, 1696.
 Mary, of May 28, 1699.
 Nathaniel, of Sept. 21, 1701.

VICCARS.

Jonathan, of Sept. 13, 1719.

VODEN.

1696 May 10. Abigail.

Abigail, of Abigail, Mar. 3, 1695.

WADE.

1708[9 Feb. 27. Anna.

WADSWORTH.

1685 1. Timothy.
 1688[9 Feb. 24. Benjamin.
 1688[9 Feb. 24. Susanna.
 1706 Sept. 15. Recompence.
 1716 Sept. 22. Susanna.

Timothy, of Timothy
 and Susannah, Nov. 6, 1692.
 Susannah, of Oct. 20, 1695.

WAGER.

Sarah, of Sarah, Aug. 29, 1714.
 Charles, of Apr. 29, 1716.

WAITS.

Mary, of Feb. 3, 1722[3

WAKEFIELD.

1682 June 6. Obadiah.
 1682[3 S.
 1706 Mar. 24. Henry.
 1716[7 Feb. 10. Experience.
 1729[0 Feb. 1. Ann.

Ann, of Obadiah, Dec. 8, 1689.
 Anna, of „ May 29, 1692.
 Deborah, of „ Apr. 21, 1695.

Ann, of Obadiah, Feb. 27, 1697[8
 John, of Eliz., Aug. 19, 1694.
 Thomas, of Jan. 9, 1697[8
 Deliverance, of Aug. 20, 1699.
 Joseph, of June 15, 1701.
 Obadiah, of Rebeck., Dec. 20, 1702.
 Rebeckah, of „ Aug. 31, 1707.
 Elizabeth, of July 11, 1703.
 Ireland, of Aug. 27, 1701.
 Henry, of Henry, July 15, 1705.
 Ann, of „ Jan. 12, 1706[7
 Susannah, of „ Aug. 27, 1710.
 Miles, of Sept. 30, 1705.
 Samuel, of July 6, 1707.
 Benjamin, of June 26, 1709.
 Susannah, of Mar. 18, 1711.
 John, of Ann, Apr. 15, 1711.
 John, of Oct. 14, 1711.
 Abigail, of July 6, 1712.
 John, of May 8, 1715.
 Miles, of Mar. 25, 1716.
 Ebenezer, of Exp., Feb. 17, 1716[7
 Experience, of Aug. 3, 1718.
 Elizabeth, of Exp., Nov. 29, 1719.
 Joseph, of Nov. 27, 1720.

WAKEHAM, or WAKUM.

James, of Eliz., July 5, 1696.
 Elizabeth, of Feb. 13, 1697[8
 Everil, of July 6, 1701.
 Robert, of Feb. 21, 1702[3
 Abraham, of Mary, Nov. 23, 1735.

WALDO.

1684 Sept. 21. Rebecca.
 1725 May 9. Hannah.

Sarah, of John, Dec. 6, 1691.
 Benja., of „ Feb. 24, 1711[2
 William, of „ Feb. 14, 1713[4

WALDRON.

Jacob, of July 11, 1723.
 John, of Sept. 12, 1725.

WALES.

1722 Apr. 15. Sarah.

WALKER, or WAKER.

1666 Sept. 16. S. [Wife of
 Thomas?]
 1682 25. Susanna.
 1691 Oct. 4. Thomas.
 1733[4 Jan. 6. Mary (bapt.).

Charles, of Apr. 23, 1693.
 Allin, of Feb. 25, 1699[0
 Elizabeth, of Feb. 25, 1699[0
 Deborah, of Oct. 12, 1701.

John, of John, June 24, 1721.
 Joseph, of Eunice, Oct. 10, 1731.
 Eunice, of " Nov. 18, 1733.
 Elizabeth, of " Apr. 17, 1737.
 John, of " June 17, 1739.
 Sarah, of " May 3, 1741.
 Thomas, of Mary, Mar. 10, 1734.
 Mary, of " Mar. 14, 1736.
 John, of " Mar. 19, 1738.
 William, of " May 24, 1741.

WALLER.

Mary, of Mary, Nov. 6, 1709.
 William, of ,, Nov. 6, 1709.

WALLIS.

Esther, of Christian, Feb. 19, 1698[9
 Sarah, of Apr. 19, 1702.
 Thomas, of Aug. 19, 1705.
 John, of Christian, July 25, 1708.

WALTER.

1680 Nov. 2. Thomas.
 1685 Mar. 1. Nehemiah.

William, of Apr. 13, 1707.

WARD.

Abigail, of Aug. 11, 1706.

WARDALE, OR (W)EL(L), OR WOODALE.
 1710 Mar. 19. Elizabeth.

Jonathan, of Aug. 28, 1698.
 (of Charlestown.)

Katharine, of Jona., Dec. 24, 1699.
 Jonathan, of May 18, 1701.
 Jonathan, of Oct. 24, 1703.
 Joseph, of Sarah, Jan. 17, 1713[4

WARCKMAN.

1688 July 6. Samuel.
 Samuel, of Mar. 17, 1695.

WARNER.

1655 Nov. 9, to
 June 3, 1657. S.
 1695 July 28. Sara.
 1719 Apr. 5. William.
 1725 Apr. 11. Mary.
 1727[8 Jan. 7. Jonathan.

William, of William, Apr. 12, 1724.
 Mary, of " Jan. 30, 1725[6
 Benjamin, of " Feb. 4, 1727[8
 John, of " Mar. 16, 1729.
 Nathaniel, of Wil-
 liam and Mary, Mar. 29, 1730.

Abigail, of William, Jan. 23, 1731[2
 Jonathan, of ,, Apr. 22, 1733.
 Mary, of " Sept. 26, 1736.
 Hannah, of William
 and Mary, Mar. 18, 1739.
 Mary, of Hannah, July 8, 1733.
 Nathl., of " Mar. 9, 1735.
 Abigail, of " Sept. 4, 1737.
 Mary, of " Apr. 20, 1740.

WARREN.

1697 Apr. 11. Sarah.
 Sarah, of Sarah, Apr. 18, 1697.
 Thomas, of June 18, 1699.

WASE.

Wilmott, of John, Feb. 10, 1711[2

WATERS.

1688[9 Feb. 17. Hannah.

Joseph, of Mary, Feb. 21, 1691[2
 John, of " Oct. 4, 1696.
 Rachel, of Ad., May 17, 1713.
 Huldah, of Huldah, June 24, 1716.
 Mary, of " July 24, 1720.
 Huldah, of " Sept. 15, 1734.
 Thomas, of " Aug. 24, 1718.
 Thomas, of Nov. 18, 1722.
 William, of May 16, 1725.
 Berry, of Aug. 20, 1727.

WATKINS.

1658 Oct. 17. B.
 1658 Oct. 17. S.

WATTS.

1711[2 Jan. 6. John.
 Elizabeth, of John, Mar. 30, 1712.
 John, of " Oct. 25, 1713.
 Elizabeth, of " Oct. 16, 1715.

WAY.

1660[1 Feb. 17. Aaron.
 1660[1 Feb. 17. S.
 1660[1 Feb. 17. Richard.
 1660[1 Feb. 17. S.
 1675 Aug. 8. Mary.
 1677 Mar. 9. William.
 1677 Mar. 9. S.
 1725 Mar. 28. Eliza.
 1728 May 5. Andrew.

Moses, of Moses, Apr. 28, 1695.
 Samuel, of " July 19, 1696.
 Elizabeth, of Dec. 10, 1724.
 Andrew, of Feb. 25, 1727[8

WEB(B).

1689[0 Feb. 23. Sara.
 1690 Mar. 23. Benjamin.
 1692[3 Jan. 15. Joseph.
 1695 June 9. Elisha.
 1714 Sept. 5. Christopher.
 1791 Elizabeth.

Mary, of Sarah, May 31, 1691.
 Hannah, of Benjamin
 and Susannah, May 20, 1694.
 Benjamin, of „ „ Dec. 15, 1695.
 Joseph, of Elisha, Feb. 19, 1698[9
 Elisha, of „ Nov. 16, 1701.
 Lydia, of „ Sept. 21, 1707.
 Thomas, of Mary, Sept. 17, 1699.
 Joseph, of Joseph, Sept. 14, 1707.
 Mary, of „ Oct. 9, 1709.
 Joseph, of „ Aug. 1, 1714.
 Samuel, of „ Oct. 20, 1717.
 Ann, of Christopher, Oct. 24, 1714.
 Samuel, of „ Oct. 7, 1716.

WEBBER.

1700 June 30. Mary.

Mary, of Mary, Aug. 4, 1700.
 Elizabeth, of July 25, 1703.
 Mary, of Mary, May 20, 1705.
 William, of Mar. 21, 1708.
 Sarah, of Aug. 30, 1713.

WEBSTER.

1664 Mar. 2. S.
 1727[8 Jan. 7. Mary.

John, of Mar. 7, 1714.
 Grant, of Feb. 2, 1717[8
 Henry, of May 15, 1720.
 Esther, of Mary, Mar. 22, 1724.
 Joanna, of June 26, 1726.
 Ann, of Sept. 17, 1727.
 Joanna, of Mary, Oct. 5, 1729.
 Thomas, of „ Oct. 3, 1731.

WEEDEN.

1691 June or July. Jane.
 1691 Nov. 1. Ruth.

Rebeckah, of Jane, Mar. 6, 1692.

WELCH.

1689[0 Jan. 26. Elizabeth.
 3 children of El., Jan. 26, 1689[0
 Rachel, of Jan. 15, 1692[3
 Susannah, of May 10, 1696.
 William, of Sept. 18, 1698.
 Benjamin, of June 8, 1701.

Ebenezer, of Jan. 28, 1704[5
 Jonathan, of July 20, 1707.

WELDE.

1719 Mar. 15. Rebecca.

WELLS.

Rebec., of Rebeckah, Oct. 6, 1700.
 Thomas, of „ Jan. 4, 1701[2

WENTWORTH. (See GOFF.)

John, of Abigail, Jan. 29, 1720[1
 Benning, of „ July 1, 1722.

WEST.

1681[2 Ann.

John, of Mar. 28, 1697.
 Mary, of Mar. 5, 1699.
 Elizabeth, of John, Oct. 9, 1737.
 John, of „ Apr. 8, 1739.
 Mary, of „ Aug. 24, 1740.

WHARFE, or WHORF.

1690 Jan. Rebecka.

Margaret, of Martha, May 19, 1695.
 Susannah, of „ Mar. 14, 1697.

WHATELY, or WHEATLY, &c.

1717 June 16. Esther.
 1719 Aug. 2. Elizabeth.

Henry, of May 5, 1717.
 Henry, of Feb. 21, 1719[0
 Elizabeth, of Aug. 12, 1722.
 Sarah, of Apr. 12, 1724.

WHEELER.

1691 Mar. 22. William.
 1691 Nov. 1. Ann.
 1707 Mar. 16. Nathanael.

Ann, of William
 and Ann, July 24, 1692.

Hannah, of Mar. 17, 1695.
 William, of William, May 2, 1697.
 Jeremiah, of Oct. 3, 1697.
 Elizabeth, of Mary, Mar. 12, 1699.
 Nathanael, of June 1, 1701.
 Mary, of June 13, 1703.
 Abigail, of Aug. 5, 1705.
 Amie, of Nathl., June 1, 1707.
 Susannah, of „ May 22, 1709.
 Nathaniel, of „ Dec. 30, 1711.
 Thomas, of „ Mar. 8, 1713.
 Sarah, of „ May 16, 1714.
 Ann, of „ Mar. 25, 1716.
 Thomas, of „ Aug. 21, 1720.
 Abigail, of Oct. 28, 1733.

Abigail, of Abigail, Aug. 25, 1734.
Mary, of ,, Aug. 21, 1737.

WHITE.

1665 May 14. S.
1672 Oct. 20. S.
1689[0 Jan. 26. Martha.
1691 May 17. Sara.
1696 June 22. Hanna.
1697 June 13. Mary.
1706 Apr. 28. Elizabeth.
1708 Mar. 28. Samuel.
1710 Nov. 5. Benjamin.
1716[7 Feb. 10. Joseph.
1722[3 Jan. 20. Elizabeth.
1725 June 6. Elizabeth.
1735 Dec. 7. Elizabeth.
1773 Oct. 31. William.
1777 Mar. 30. Mary.

Samuel, of Ann, May 13, 1694.
Ann, of ,, Mar. 8, 1696.
Mary, of ,, Feb. 20, 1697[8
Joseph, of ,, Apr. 12, 1702.

Prudence, }
Phillippa, } of }
Samuel, } Han- } June 28, 1696.
Michael, } nah, }

Nathanael, }
Hannah, of Apr. 10, 1698.
Lydia, of Mar. 10, 1700.
Elizabeth, of Sept. 29, 1700.
Ann, of May 24, 1702.
Joseph, of Oct. 10, 1703.
Nathanael, of Jan. 13, 1705[6
Eliza, of Sept. 7, 1707.
Thomas, of Mar. 7, 1708.
Ebenezer, of Mar. 5, 1710.
Isaac, of Rebeckah, Aug. 24, 1712.
John, of ,, Dec. 12, 1714.
Mary, of ,, Sept. 27, 1713.
Joseph, of Nov. 14, 1714.
Benja., of Benjamin, Sept. 4, 1715.
John, of ,, Dec. 30, 1716.
Elizabeth, of Dec. 9, 1716.
Anna, of Apr. 14, 1717.
John, of June 1, 1719.
John, of Nov. 22, 1719.
James, of Apr. 8, 1722.
Benjamin, of Joseph, May 20, 1722.
John, of ,, Mar. 15, 1724.

Martha, of Joseph
and Elizabeth, Aug. 1, 1725.
John, of ,, Aug. 14, 1726.
Mary, of Joseph, Oct. 8, 1727.
Mary, of Joseph

and Eliza, Aug. 23, 1730.
Nathaniel, of Jos., Oct. 3, 1731.
Hannah, of ,, Dec. 31, 1732.

Isaac, of Joseph
and Eliza, July 14, 1734.
Frances, of ,, Oct. 5, 1735.
Ann, of Joseph, Oct. 7, 1739.
Samuel, of Samuel, Aug. 19, 1722.
Elizabeth, of Samuel
and Eliza, Feb. 2, 1723[4
John, of Samuel, July 25, 1725.
Francis, of Samuel
and Eliza, Apr. 16, 1727.
Elizabeth, ,, Feb. 2, 1728[9
Samuel, of Mary
(formerly Norvel), Oct. 21, 1738.

WHITEHEAD.

Sarah, of Jan. 2, 1714[5
Samuel, of Feb. 9, 1717[8
Mary, of May 8, 1720.

WHITING.

1719 May 10. David.

Whitfield, of David, May 9, 1725.

WHITTAMORE.

John, of May 16, 1714.
Daniel, of Feb. 5, 1715[6
Elizabeth, of June 24, 1716.
Joel, of Pelatiah, Dec. 16, 1716.
Samuel, of Aug. 11, 1717.
Edward, of Aug. 21, 1718.
Sarah, of Mar. 5, 1721.
Ruth, of July 31, 1726.
Joseph, of Ruth, June 18, 1727.

WHITTENGAM.

1697[8 Feb. 20. Richard.

WHITTREDGE.

Phebe, Jan. 14, 1693[4
Susanna, of above, Jan. 14, 1693[4
Richard, Jan. 14, 1693[4
Mary, of ,, Feb. 11, 1693[4
Susannah, of Richard
and Phebe, Mar. 8, 1696.
Phebe, ,, Apr. 16, 1699.

WHITWELL.

1661 Mar. 10. S.
1673 Apr. 6. S.
Prior to 1786. Mary.

WIAR, or WIER, or WYER.

1711 June 3. Mary.

Daniel, of Lydia, Oct. 20, 1700.
Lydia, of ,, Sept. 14, 1707.
Elias, } of }
Hannah, } Daniel, } Feb. 11, 1704[5

Mary, of Dec. 23, 1705.
(of Concord.)
Ruth, of Dec. 5, 1708.
Mary, of Oct. 16, 1709.
Lydia, of Sept. 21, 1712.
Ephraim, of Aug. 2, 1713.
Joseph, of Mar. 10, 1717.

WIENER.
Stephen, of June 20, 1714.

WILDER.
Susannah, of Nov. 29, 1713.

WILKINS.
1681 Mar. 1. Susanna.
1695 June 30. John.

Susanna, of Susanna, Apr. 14, 1690.
Susannah, of John, Feb. 27, 1697[8
John, of " Oct. 22, 1699.
Joseph, of Oct. 19, 1701.
Elizabeth, of John, Jan. 23, 1703[4

WILLARD.
1716[7 Jan. 20. Daniel.

Katharine, of Daniel
and Abigail, Aug. 4, 1717.
Abigail, of " " Nov. 2, 1718.
Mary, of " " Mar. 6, 1720.
Ann, of Daniel, May 26, 1723.

WILLER.
1709[0 Feb. 19. Mary.

WILLET, or WILLETT.
1681 May 29. Sarah.

Sarah, of Susannah, May 5, 1695.
Andrew, of Oct. 23, 1698.
Mary, of Nov. 23, 1701.
Joseph, of May 7, 1704.
Mary, of William, Mar. 17, 1706.
William, of " July 13, 1707.
Mary, of " Sept. 4, 1709.
Mary, of Thomas, May 29, 1709.
Thomas, of Oct. 14, 1711.
Thomas, of Thomas, Oct. 12, 1712.
Sarah, of Apr. 25, 1714.
Martha, of May 16, 1714.
Sarah, of June 17, 1716.
John, of Sept. 9, 1716.
William, of Martha, Nov. 4, 1716.
Stephen, of Aug. 24, 1718.
William, of Aug. 28, 1720.

WILLIAMS.
1655 Nov. 9, to
June 3, 1657. S.

1693 Sept. 24. Joanna.
1725 May 9. Elizabeth.

Bridget, of El. Smith, Nov. 8, 1691.
Abraham, of " " Nov. 8, 1691.
Elizabeth, of " " Nov. 8, 1691.
Elizabeth, of Sarah, May 19, 1695.
James, of May 23, 1697.
Abraham, of June 25, 1699.
Sarah, of July 12, 1702.
Ann, of Ann, Aug. 12, 1711.
Benjamin, of May 25, 1712.
Phebe, of May 31, 1713.
Elizabeth, of May 9, 1714.
Alexander, of Feb. 5, 1715[6
Nathaniel, of July 29, 1716.
Rachel, of Sept. 22, 1717.
Alexander, of May 25, 1718.
Mary, of Oct. 11, 1719.
John, of Mar. 18, 1722.
John, of May 10, 1724.

WILLIS, or WILLS.
1650 June 5. Michael.
1658[9 Jan. 16. S. Wills.
1677 Mar. 23. Elizabeth Wills.
1715[6 Feb. 12. Mary.

William, of Sept. 13, 1713.

WILSON.
1689[0 Jan. 26. Bethiah.
1691 May 17. Mary.
1691 June 7. Andrew.
1693 Dec. 24. Joseph.
1725 May 2. William.
1727 Nov. 12. Mary.

Three children of
Bethiah, Jan. 26, 1689[0
David, of Andrew
and Bethiah, Dec. 27, 1691.
Mercy, of Andrew, Feb. 18, 1693[4
Abigail, of Abigail, May 16, 1697.
Eliza, of Andrew, Feb. 25, 1704[5
Rebeckah, of Wm., Mar. 9, 1718.

WINSLEY.
1691 Nov. 29. Mercy.
1694[5 Feb. 10. Hopeskill.
1700 Apr. 21. Sarah.

WINSLOW.
1780 Apr. 23. Sarah.
John, of Sarah, July 25, 1703.
Penel., of " May 13, 1705.

WINTER.

1709	Nov. 6.	Mehetabel.
1730	Mar. 1.	William.
1734	Sept. 29.	Martha.
1737	Apr. 10.	William.

Edward, of	Oct. 28, 1711.
Martha, of	Nov. 29, 1719.
Edward, of	July 23, 1721.
Joshua, of	Dec. 8, 1723.
Edward, of	June 19, 1726.
William, of William,	Apr. 8, 1739.

WINTHROP.

1682	Apr. 30.	Adam.
1682	Apr. 30.	S.
1705	Mar. 4.	Adam.
1706	Nov. 10.	Ann.
1727	Nov. 19.	Ann.
1736	Apr. 25.	Samuel.

Ann, of Adam,	June 25, 1704.
Adam, of „	Aug. 18, 1706.
Ann, of Adam and	

Ann, of „	Ann, Sept. 21, 1707.
John, of „	„ Aug. 14, 1709.
John, of „	„ Dec. 16, 1711.
John, of „	„ Mar. 15, 1713.
John, of Adam,	Dec. 12, 1714.
Samuel, of Adam	

and Ann,	June 17, 1716.
William, of „	„ July 7, 1717.
Mary, of Adam,	Aug. 31, 1718.
Mary, of Adam and	

Ann, of „	Ann, Sept. 27, 1719.
Lucy, of Adam,	Aug. 27, 1721.
William, of „	Dec. 1, 1723.
Mary, of Adam and	
Ann,	Mar. 28, 1725.

WISWAL.

Elizabeth, of Peleg,	Nov. 6, 1720.
Daniel, of „	Feb. 17, 1722[3
Priscilla, of „	Dec. 19, 1725.

WOOD, &c.

1692	May 29.	Abigail.
------	---------	----------

John, of Richard

Woods,	Nov. 20, 1715.
Mary, of	July 21, 1717.

Thomas, of Richard

Woode,	Oct. 6, 1717.
Sarah, of Sarah,	Apr. 12, 1724.

WOODBERRY.

Hannah, of Hannah,	Feb. 20, 1714[5
Andrew, of „	Apr. 29, 1716.
William, of „	June 2, 1717.

WOODMAN.

1786		Abigail.
------	--	----------

WOODWARD.

1690	May 25.	Mary.
1768	June 10.	Mary.

Elizabeth, of Pris-	
cilla,	Nov. 18, 1711.
Nathaniel, of „	Oct. 18, 1713.
Samuel, of	Sept. 18, 1715.

WOODWEL.

1716	Nov. 25.	Joseph.
------	----------	---------

WORMWELL.

1725	Nov. 14.	Hannah.
------	----------	---------

Daniel, of Hannah,	May 13, 1711.
Lydia, of „	May 13, 1711.

WORTHYLAKE.

1696	June 22.	Sara.
------	----------	-------

WRIGHT.

Mary, of Mary,	Apr. 3, 1720.
William, of	Mar. 31, 1723.
Elizabeth, of Mary,	Jan. 24, 1724[5
Sarah, of „	Jan. 24, 1724[5

WYKES.

1689	Sept. 8.	Deliverance.
------	----------	--------------

William, of Deliv.,	Feb. 23, 1689[0
Jane, of „	Apr. 3, 1692.
Ebenezer, of „	Nov. 26, 1693.
Elizabeth, of „	Oct. 28, 1694.
Hannah, of Ebenezer	
and Deliverance,	Jan. 12, 1695[6
Elizabeth, of Deliv.,	July 18, 1697.
Ebenezer, of „	Sept. 24, 1699.

YEARS.

1714	May 30.	Mary.
------	---------	-------

Sarah, of Mary,	June 13, 1714.
Mary, of	Nov. 27, 1715.
Charles, of	Feb. 17, 1716[7

YEATS.

John, of	Sept. 22, 1723.
Hannah, of	Sept. 22, 1723.
Thomas, of	Mar. 20, 1726.
Benjamin, of	Oct. 8, 1727.

YOUNG.

Robert, of Lydia,	Feb. 8, 1735[6
-------------------	----------------

BLANK.			
1707	Nov. 9.	Desire.	Eliphal, of Jan. 15, 1698[9
1709[0	Jan. 22.	Deliverance.	John, of Jan. 15, 1698[9
1727[8	Jan. 7.	Joanna.	Ann, of Jan. 15, 1698[9
1727[8	Feb. 4.	Edward.	Jane, of Eli., Feb. 25, 1704[5
1740[1	Feb. 15.	Abigail.	Mercy, of Oct 7, 1711.
			John, of Jan. 3. 1713[4
			William, of Nov. 30, 1718.
Benjamin, of	July 27, 1690.	Ann, of	Dec. 30, 1722.
Elizabeth, of	Jan. 15, 1698[9	James, of	July 25, 1725.

In the foregoing catalogue, the letters B. and S., which often occur, stand for Brother and Sister of the church.

CHURCH CENSURES.

CURIOUS CASE OF JOHN FARNUM.

Increase Mather writes in the Church Records: "Concerning censures, through the merciful and gracious providence of Christ, the church hath been but twice put upon that work since I was related to them. One sister hath been cast out of the communion, and one brother, viz., John Farnum, which is the more sad because he was one of the first members in the church. Having, in the time of it, kept a faithful narrative of the procedure against him, I cause it to be inserted here."

"MATTERS OF OFFENCE AGAINST JOHN FARNUM.

"I. He hath offended in breaking the rule of truth, and that in more particulars than one. 1. In saying to many that he desired a church-meeting, but was denied it. 2. In affirming that Thomas Gold was cast out of the church of Charlestown by Mr. Simms and Mr. Shepard, against the consent of the major part of the church; and that it was a wicked act of them that did it. Thus he affirmed to the teacher alone. And after that, upon the same day, to diverse (Brother Gibson and Brother Wills) of the brethren. And after that, to the pastor and teacher both together. 3. That Thomas Gold desired to know whether he were a member of the church of Charlestown, and they would give him no answer. Now, in these particulars, he hath violated the rules of God's word. Exod. xx. 16. Eph. iv. 25. Psalm xv. 3.

"II. Another evil which he is guilty of is rash and sinful judging, and that of a whole church of Christ, having condemned the whole church of Charlestown of *irregular, rash, wicked* proceeding (those being his words);

and that, too, before he hath heard the church speaking for themselves, contrary to Matt. vii. 1. James, iv. 11. Proverbs, xvii. 15.

“ III. He is an offender also by breaking covenant with the church, and becoming guilty of schism. When he joined to the church, he promised (yea, and set his hand to that covenant) to walk with the church in all the ordinances of God ; whereas he hath forsaken all the ordinances of God with the church, being wont upon the Lord’s day to forsake the public assembly and go to another disorderly meeting, and turneth his back upon the table of the Lord, as well as upon the word and prayer. In this respect he hath greatly transgressed against the Lord, and broken many holy precepts of the word. 1 Cor. i. 10. Gal. v. 12. Rom. xvi. 17. Heb. x. 25. John, ii. 19. Gen. xvii. 14. Matt. xxviii. 20. 1 Cor. xi. 22.

“ IV. He hath offended God and his people by holding such communion with excommunicate persons as whereby he doth manifest his approval of that state and way which such persons are in. By this evil practice he hath grieved the Spirit of God in the hearts of the people, and gone directly against the rule, 2 Thess. iii. 6, 14. Matt. xviii. 17. It must appear that such persons were unjustly censured, before such communion can lawfully be maintained with them.

“ V. Unto all these his evils he hath added contumacy and hardness of heart. For when the elders told him (when he was before them) that his carriages and speeches were offensive, he replied to them *that they might be offended at a thousand things, if they wanted, he cared not*; and also said to them at the same time, *that there was never an elder in the country that would have any one read the Scriptures beside themselves*. Thus transgressing the commandment, Exod. xx. 12. 1 Tim. v. 1, 17. Heb. xiii. 17. 1 Thess. v. 12, 13; as well as violating the rule of truth in this unworthy and most sinful charge against many renowned men of God.

“ These matters of offence were distinctly and particularly mentioned by the officers at a church-meeting, 6th of 7th moneth, 1665; and pressed upon the conscience of the offender, showing him what rules of the word he had transgressed in every of these particulars. He justified himself in what he had said and done: only he said, as to his judging the church of Charlestown, he might, through zeal and passion, go a little beyond bounds, for his impudence wherein he was sorry. Whereupon the church declared themselves unsatisfied with him, and appointed him to attend the church at another meeting; in the mean time waiting to see if the Lord would give him repentance unto life. He told the church he would not promise to meet them again.

“ Upon the 15th 7 mo. the church met again, when the former evils were severally again repeated to the offending party, and another thing was then alleged, viz., that he had spoken falsely against his conscience in reporting that the teacher forbade him from coming to the Lord’s table, and that therefore he forbore coming. At first he would not own that he had

so spoken ; but two of the church-members, Brother Wills and Sister Williams, did witness to his face that he had so said unto them ; whereupon he owned that in that, as well as in other respects, he had spoken falsely and wickedly. But he added withal, that *the church must not expect that he should whine and blubber and keep a stirr*. Which words, considering also the manner how he expressed them, gave the church cause to fear that his verbal confession of his evil (so far as he *did* confess) was not from the spirit of unfeigned repentance. There was more time given him to consider of his evil, that if possibly the church might gain his soul from the snares of sin and Satan and death.

“ Upon 16 of 8 mo. the church met again. The pastor declared to the peccant brother, that the church now expected a manifestation of repentance, and hoped that the Lord would now help him in it, inasmuch as the church had exercised much patience towards him. He replied, saying, *‘I desire none of your patience, and have nothing to say to you but what I have said formerly, and that God has humbled me for my sins, and I have peace of conscience.’* The teacher told him his evils were such as must be wayed with brokenness of heart. He replied, *‘My heart is broken.’* Whereupon the teacher rejoined, *‘But, brother, we must see it broken, by the fruits and effects of it.’* To whom the offender answered, *‘You shall not see it.’* ‘Nay,’ said the teacher, ‘but we must see it, or how can we receive satisfaction!’ Whereupon he replied again, with great bitterness, *‘You see it! You shall never see it!’* Then some of the brethren told him his carriage and speeches were very sinful and offensive, and they had not seen the like. Unto them he replied, *‘I did not come here to be snapt and snub’d and snarled at by every one.’* Then, turning his back to go away, the pastor said to him, ‘Brother Farnum, in the name of the church and in the name of Christ, whose church we are, you are required to stay and hear what further we have to say unto you.’ He replied, *‘Don’t use the name of Christ to me; I am not one that can stoop and bow to every one,’* and flung himself away, refusing to hear the church and officers solemnly speaking to him in the name of the Lord Jesus. After that he was gone, the church resolved to send two brethren to call him back again from his own house, and, if he came, to lay him under a solemn admonition. When the brethren came to him, he told them he should be glad if the church would censure him; for then he should leave them, and have a better society. Upon his coming, the pastor, in the name of Christ and the church, solemnly admonished him to repent of the evils which he had been convicted of. After the admonition, he said, ‘You may proceed to censure me, if you please: I desire none of your *patience*.’ The teacher saying to him, ‘The Lord humble you and pardon you,’ he replied, ‘And the Lord humble the church, for I think they have need enough of it,’ and so flung out of the door in a very scornful manner.

“ Upon 13th of 10 mo. the church met again, to see what effect

the admonition which was laid upon him might have. He presented a paper, wherein were some general acknowledgments of his evil, and some passages that were untrue, and more offensive. The church was not willing to take notice of his paper, but declared that they expected a real and cordial repentance. He confessed in words that he was to blame in reporting untruly of Mr. Simms and Mr. Shepard, and in disorderly carriage when he was last before the church; but as to the evil of his schism, covenant-breaking, disorderly maintaining communion with excommunicated persons, he would own no guilt as to those particulars. Also, when he confessed his evil in other matters, he turned about and laughed, which was very offensive unto the church.

“Upon 5th of 11 mo. the church met again. He gave no satisfaction to the church, but had diverse passages which were more offensive. This day he denied that he had so spoken concerning Mr. Simms and Mr. Shepard, as formerly he had been convicted of, and also had confessed his evil in such speeches.

“Upon 16th of 12 mo. He acknowledged evils and miscarriages in the general. This day, when the pastor was preaching about infant-baptism, he was observed to go out of the meeting-house in such a manner as was uncomely and offensive. The teacher asked him before the church whether he had any just cause to go out of the assembly, or whether he did it not in contempt of the word which was speaking; unto which he would give no answer. The teacher urged him (so did the brethren, some of them), saying, ‘If you should ask *me* such a question, I would answer *you*.’ Yet he would give no answer.

“Upon 30th of 1 mo. 1666, the church met again to wait for the repentance of the offending party. The pastor declared particularly what his offences were. He would not fall under a sense of his evils, but said, ‘that as for his turning his back upon the word when the pastor was preaching, if he heard such a matter again, it may be he might do the like again; and that the church should do four things, or else *he* would not have communion with *them*: 1. They must set up the ordinance of prophecy; 2. They must not baptize infants; 3. They must all be baptized themselves; 4. They must put away their teacher, and not own him for an officer.’

“The teacher having declared unto the church the heinousness of those evils which this impenitent offender was guilty of, and that therefore the rule of Christ did require that there should be a procedure unto the highest censure; after that the teacher had ended his speech in endeavoring to clear up the rule before the church, this offending party *made a leg* to him in a way of scorn and derision before the church. For which contempt and profeness of spirit in not considering the presence of God, angels and saints, before whom he was then standing as a delinquent, he was by the pastor reproved. The issue of this meeting was, that the church unani-

mously concluded that they must, in the fear and name of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ, proceed unto the sad and dreadful censure of excommunication; only they declared that, if before the 22d of 2d month he manifested repentance, that sorrowful work would be gladly prevented.

“Upon 22d of 2d month. In the public congregation, the teacher having preached two sermons on Matt. xviii. 18, the said John Farnum was called forth. (N.B. He sat in the highest gallery [there were two, one above the other], where few in the meeting-house could see him; and, when the pastor spake to him to come down, he replied, ‘*You may speak to me here, if you have any thing to say to me: I can hear you well enough.*’ And it was a long time before he would vouchsafe to come down.) It was put to him in the face of the congregation, that if he had an heart given to him to repent of his evils, in breaches of the ninth commandment and of the fifth commandment, as also of his breach of covenant, his schism, his disorderly walking in holding irregular communion with censured persons, before it did appear that they were unjustly censured, &c., that then the sad sentence of being delivered unto Satan should be prevented. He said ‘that he was guilty of no such evils, and that we cast him out only for his conscience, because he was against the baptism of infants.’ It was replied to him that he might be of *that opinion still*; and, if he would walk as did become the gospel, no censure should be laid upon him for his opinion, for there are diverse in the church of that opinion, whose children were never baptized, and we are far from censuring of them.

“He used diverse unseemly speeches and earriages in the meeting-house, saying to the pastor and the church, ‘*Much good may your baptism do you!*’ in a light manner expressing it. Likewise he smiled and laughed in the face of the congregation, which occasioned the teacher to say, ‘What a sad spectacle is here! A poore creature ready to be delivered up into the hands of Satan, to be bound in heaven and earth; and yet his heart is so strangely besotted and hardened with guilt and sin, and the wrath of God against his soul, that he even laugheth at the calamity which is coming upon him!’

“At the last he turned about and smiled, saying, ‘*The place is too hot for me.*’ By which words he caused many vaine youths to burst forth into an open laughter in the midst of a work so awfull and dreadfull, and went to go out of the congregation. The pastor required him, in the name of Christ, to stay; but he refused to hear the church, and went away out of the congregation. When he was gone, the pastor did, in the name of the Lord Jesus, the Judge of quick and dead, deliver this impenitent and profane offender unto Satan, for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit might be saved. Now, out of the hands of Satan, whose at present he is, the Lord, if it be possible, deliver him.”

This sentence was delivered in 1666. Nothing more is heard

of the offender for about seventeen years. The next and final notice of him is the following, in Increase Mather's handwriting :

“On the 31 day of the 6 mo. 1683, John Farnum came to me with brother Collicot, expressing his desires of returning to communion with this church again. The next Lord's day I acquainted the brethren with his motion, who, upon the reading of his confession, were willing he should be readmitted, provided he did publicly owne it. The next Lecture-day” (Thursday lecture) “I read his confession amongst the ministers who met at Mr. Willard's. None of the elders there present objected against receiving him ; but Mr. Eliot said that he thought the church would sin if they did *not* receive him upon that acknowledgment. September 9, 1683 : His confession was read in the public congregation, owned by himself, and accepted by the church ; so that the censure was then taken of, and he received to communion. His confession was in these words following : —

““God hath convinced me of my great evil and sin in the matters for which the church dealt with me about, both in word and action ; not only in the things charged on me, but also in my carriage and behavior, especially in the time of their dealing with me. My manifold miscarriages, both in words irreverently and unbecoming a Christian, and in my gestures in the time of the church's patience and dealing with me, both towards the elders and towards my brethren also, they were so great that I am ashamed before God and man ; and I am heartily glad I have a season to confess them to God's glory and my own shame, which I have often begged pardon of God for, and do now beg the same of yon, my brethren, for Christ's sake ; for I know my evils are greatly aggravated by my passionate corruption, which is my great evil.

““This is freely acknowledged, in hopes to find acceptance, by me,
JOHN FARNUM.’”

Note in Church Records. — “Several of the church (viz., Brother Collicot and Brother Way) did, by the desire of the church, enquire of some of the Anabaptists' Society (viz., Skinner and —) whether they had any matter of scandal to object against John Farnum, because then we would not receive him again. They said they had not, and that they had nothing to object against him but only his leaving them.”

OTHER INTERESTING AND CURIOUS VOTES.

Allusion has been made to a vote of the church in 1676, on the occasion of building the second house of worship of the Second Church, that no pews should be made with a door into

the street. It is evident from the same vote that the society built no pews in the house, but only provided ranges of seats. Any individual who desired was permitted to build a pew for himself; but he could not dispose of it if he wished to leave it, the church reserving to themselves that right.

“2d mo. 21 day, 1678. — The brethren consented that Brother Blake should be dismissed, or permitted to joyn with the brethren of Milton, who purpose (if the Lord will) to gather into a church-society.

“25th 4th mo. — At a church-meeting, voted, that Mr. John Cotton be desired to assist the teacher, in preaching once a fortnight; and that twenty pounds per annum, in money, shall be given him: to be paid quarterly, in case he accept of this invitation.

“30th day, 1 mo. 1680. — Voted, that Mr. Avery be desired to join unto this church, in order to his being chosen a ruling elder amongst us; in case, upon further experience, the Lord shall make the way clear, both on his part and ours.

“14 day, 2 mo. 1691. — Voted, that Lieut. Way, Mr. Gill, Mr. Robee, and Mr. Barnard, be desired to take the care of seating persons in the meeting-house.

“Voted, that the pastor be desired to take what care he shall judge proper in choosing and settling fit persons for the inspection of the children in the meeting-house.

“1694, 8th day, 2 mo. — Two young women belonging to the communion, to wit, Rebeckah Adams and Alice Pennel, having been guilty of consulting an ungodly fortune-teller in the neighborhood, with desire to be informed of some secret and future things, this day in public made a penitent acknowledgment of that miscarriage; and so the church was reconciled unto them.

“1700, 11th day, 5th mo. — The brethren of the church being assembled at the desire of the Governor and the General Assembly, and messengers from both Houses in the Assembly coming to them with a motion that they would consent unto the removal of their teacher's residence to the Colledge at Cambridge, the ensuing vote was passed: —

“‘Being under the sense of the great benefit we have long enjoyed by the labor of our pastor, the Rev. Increase Mather, among us, it must needs be unreasonable and impossible for us to consent that his relations to us, and our enjoyment of him and them, should cease.

“‘Nevertheless, the respect we have to the desire and welfare of the publick does compel us to consent that our good pastor may so remove his personal residence to the Colledge at Cambridge as may be consistent with the continuance of his relation to us, and his visits of us, with his publick administrations, as often as his health and strength may allow it.’

“1707, 19 day, 8 mo. — Mr. John Barnard having given scandal by

the liberty he took of using the scandalous game of cards, when he was lately a chaplain abroad in the army, he this day made his public acknowledgment, which gave satisfaction to the people of God.

“1715. — Voted, *nomine contradicente*, by the brethren, after the pastor had withdrawn, that the house of Mr. Thomas Hutchinson, in Ship-street, now vacant, be hired for the accommodation of the Rev. Dr. Cotton Mather, at the charge of the church, until some further provision be made for him. (Drawn up by Col. Winthrop.)

“1727, 28 day, 11 mo. — Whereas, in the holy providence of our Lord, his aged servant, our reverend and dear pastor, Dr. Cotton Mather, is visited and brought low by sickness, which takes him off from those exercises of the pastoral care, whereby God has greatly endeared him to us, and threatens his removal from us by death, which we would deprecate as a most awful frown of Heaven, — we do therefore desire and appoint next Wednesday afternoon to be set apart and employed in humble, penitent, and earnest supplications to God our Saviour, that it may please him to restore and confirm the health of his servant, and prolong his life and usefulness as a rich blessing to his people. And we humbly desire the Rev. Mr. Colman, Mr. Thacher, and Mr. Sewall, to assist in the services which are called for on this occasion.”

BILL OF FARE FOR ORDINATION, 1722.

“To be sent to Mr. Townsend’s [for ministers entertained there], one plum cake, one Cheser cheese, $\frac{1}{2}$ barrel beer, two bread bricks, $\frac{1}{2}$ doz. Canary wine, two pounds fresh butter, $\frac{1}{2}$ barrel ale.

From the cook’s shop: three small pattyes, 12 doz. tarts.

To boil: 5 hams bacon, 5 leggs porke, 15 neat tongues, 2 doz. fowles.

To rost: 5 pieces beefe, 5 loins of veal, 5 qrs. lamb.

All sorts of sauce, as anehovies, pickles, greens, sallets, sparrow grass, oysters, onions, cramberrys.

40 lbs. butter, eggs, $\frac{1}{4}$ hund. reasons, $\frac{1}{4}$ do. corants, spice of all sorts, 16 pudings.

Lickquer: 1 bl. beere, 1 bl. cyder, 1 quarter cask Madeira wine, $\frac{1}{4}$ hundred powder sugar, 1 loaf refine do., 1 galloon vinegar, $\frac{1}{2}$ galloon lim-juice.

40 bread bricks, pips and tobacco, 1 dozen drinking glasses.

To looke after the dressing: Mrs. Black, Delly, Mrs. Arnold.

$\frac{1}{2}$ cord wood, rose water, radishess, turnups, potatoes, cabbage, mustard.”

The names of the deacons of the Second Church, as far as I have been able to ascertain from the records, are the following: —

John Phillips, Christopher Gibson, John Atwood, Obadiah Gill, John Barnard, Thomas Baker, John Buchanan, Grafton Feveryeare, William Larrabee, Edward Langdon, — Proctor, Thomas Tyler, Jonathan Brown, Wm. Bordman, John Tudor, Thos. Greenough, Samuel Ridgway, Wm. Bell, Benjamin Henderson, Samuel Parkman, Thomas Lewis, James Foster, Peter Mackintosh, jun., Enoch Patterson, R. W. Bayly, J. N. Daniell, Samuel G. Simpkins, Simon W. Robinson, Nathan Clark, Isaac Adams.

LEGACIES AND DONATIONS TO THE SECOND CHURCH.

Capt. Samuel Scarlet, by his last will, left a legacy of twelve pounds per annum to the Second Church in Boston, and the poor thereof. Major Richards bequeathed a legacy of one hundred pounds to the Second Church, the yearly profits thereof to be towards the maintenance of the poor belonging to said church, to be applied according to the direction of the teaching officer or officers. Madam Foster bequeathed the sum of one hundred pounds to the Second Church, to be employed for the relief of the poor belonging to said church in communion with it. Dr. Increase Mather left five pounds by his last will for the benefit of the poor of the church. Dame Dorothy Saltonstall left by her will fifty pounds to the poor of the church, and fifty pounds for a flagon; also a strip of land adjoining the meeting-house (in North Square). Mrs. Rachel Shute gave, by an instrument, five hundred pounds to the poor of the church, to be received after her decease; but, her property having become somewhat reduced, she afterwards requested that the "instrument" might be returned. The church voted that the Trustees named in the instrument should be allowed to give it up, upon the receipt of a sum not less than twenty pounds for the whole. Hon. Thomas Hutchinson bequeathed several sums of money for the use of the poor of the church. Madam Frizzel gave a lot of land to the church. Deacon Samuel Parkman was a liberal benefactor to the church and society. Deacon John Tudor contributed largely to its funds.

Adam Winthrop also deserves honorable mention in this connection. The living benefactors to the church, of whom there are several belonging to the society, would not wish to have their names written in this catalogue. Some future minister who may write the history of the present period will be as glad to search out their acts of Christian generosity, and as pleased to record them, as we are in rescuing from oblivion those who of old have loved and remembered our venerated church.

The following address was delivered to the people in the meeting-house by Deacon Tudor. It must be remembered that the currency had been depreciated.

“ June, 1779.

“ To our Brethren and Sisters in the Gallery, and to som below, I am, &c., Yrs., J. T. : by the Comte. I am desir'd to acquaint you with what perhaps som of you have not heard of, — that our Revd. Ministers sallery, and also the Saxtons, is lately rais'd ; but the Contrebuton is not suffisiant at present to pay it.

“ Therefor, first to you our Breathren, even to som who may work by the Day, you have from 10 to 12 Dollors a Day, which is from 60 to 72 Dollors per Week : now suppose you, my friends, should give 6s. a Sabbath, 'tis but a 70th part of your incom ; nay, supposeing you did not earn but half so much, it would not be a 30th part. As to you our Sisters, boath above and below, even to those who may go oute to Jorning or som other Busness, you have 4 Dollors a Day, which is 24 Dols. per Week : now, if you should give 3s. a Sabbath, it would be but a 48th part of your earnings. But som will say, we are not imploy'd half our time in that way. Supposeing that to be the case, the 3s. is but a 24th part of your earnings.

“ Now, my friends, if we are attentive hearers to the 2 Sermons and 4 prayers we hear, or may hear, every Lords-day from this pulpit, wil recompence us only in our Temporal conserns a 1000 fould for the small matter we may Weekly Contribute. *But*, if we carry it to our Speritual conserns, the comparison of a few Shillings will be *but* as a drop of Water to the Otion.

“ The advantage to our better part will be 10 Thousand times 10 thousand in our favor, and that to all Eternity, should God be pleased to say Amen to the joint petitions from the pulpit & our own hearts. But I may not enlarge ; but permit me to remind you & my self of 2 or 3 exortations from St Paul, in the 1st of Corinthians. 9 Chapr. 13th and 14 verses : ‘ They which waite at the alter are pertakers with the alter : Even so hath the

Lord ordained, that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel.' Again, the same Apostel in the 2d Corinthians. Chapr. 9th, 6th and 7th Verss. tels us *that* he which soweth Sparingly shall reap also sparingly ; and he which soweth Bountifully shall reap also Bountifully. Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give : Not grudgingly, or of Necessity ; for *God* loveth a *cheerful* giver. Once more, in Hebrews, Chapr. 13th and 16th Vs. : 'To do good & to distrebut, forget not : *for* with such sacrifices *God* is well pleased.' Hear I mite mention many places of Scripture, and bring many arguments to enforce the point before us, but the present time wil not admit of it ; and we shal rest it with your Serious consideration, and hope for your generous compliance."

Mr. Emerson was chosen by a vote of seventy-four out of eighty-three, — the worshippers voting with the proprietors. The order of services at his ordination was as follows, viz. : Dr. Pierce, of Brookline, offered the introductory prayer, and read the Scriptures ; Mr. Ripley, of Waltham, preached from the text, "Preaching peace by Jesus Christ ;" Mr. Parkman, of the New North, made the ordaining prayer ; Dr. Ripley, of Concord, gave the charge ; Mr. Frothingham, of the First Church, the right hand of fellowship ; Mr. Gannett, of the Federal-street Church, the address to the people ; Mr. Upham, of Salem, the concluding prayer.

The present pastor of the Second Church and Society was chosen by a unanimous vote of the proprietors, Oct. 20, 1833. At his ordination, which took place Dec. 4, 1833, the order of services was as follows, viz. : Introductory prayer, and selections from Scripture, by Rev. John Pierpont ; sermon by Prof. Henry Ware, jun. ; ordaining prayer by Rev. Hezekiah Packard, D.D. ; charge by Rev. James Kendall, D.D. ; fellowship of the churches by Rev. Francis Parkman ; concluding prayer by Rev. George Putnam.

COVENANT OF THE SECOND CHURCH.

On the 16th of September, 1821, the church voted to restore and adopt for their use, on the admission of members, the ancient

covenant used by Dr. Increase Mather. It is in these words, viz. : —

“ You do, in this solemn presence, give up yourself to the true God in Jesus Christ, and to his people also, according to the will of God ; promising to walk with God, and with this church of his, in all his holy ordinances, and to yield obedience to every truth of his, which has been or shall be made known to you as your duty ; the Lord assisting you by his spirit and grace.

“ We, then, the church of Christ in this place, do receive you into the fellowship, and promise to walk towards you, and to watch over you as a member of this church, endeavoring your spiritual edification in Christ Jesus our Lord.”

LIBRARY OF THE CHURCH.

A valuable library belongs to the Second Church, which was founded at the suggestion of Joshua Gee, and received donations from several clergymen and others. In 1827, at the request of Mr. Ware, who stated that efforts were making to build up a library for the Theological School at Cambridge, the church “ voted, that the pastor be authorized to select such volumes as he may think proper from its library, and make a donation of them to the library of the Theological School, with the proviso, that the minister of the Second Church shall always have free use of the library of the Theological School.”

COMMUNION PLATE.

At the time of the union of the Second and New Brick Churches, several valuable articles of silver plate, being unnecessary, were sold. The following is a description of the silver communion plate now in possession of the Second Church : —

“ One large Flagon, with this inscription thereon : ‘ Mrs. Elizabeth Wensley to the Second Church of Christ in Boston, 1711.’ Also stamped on the bottom ‘ ro.’

One large Flagon, inscribed : ‘ The Legacy of Mr. John Frisell, who died April 10, 1723, to the Second Church of Christ in Boston.’ Also a coat of arms is engraved thereon, with this motto : ‘ *Jesu est Prest.*’ Also stamped with the letters ‘ IB ’ twice on the body of the flagon, near the handle.

One large Flagon, inscribed : ' This Flagon is the gift of Mrs. Dorothy Frisell to the Second Church of Christ in Boston, December, 1733.'

One smaller Flagon, inscribed : ' The gift of Mrs. Dorothy Frisell to the Church of Christ in Boston, of which the Rev. Mr. William Waldron is the pastor, 1724.' Also stamped ' R.'

One large Flagon, inscribed : ' The Rev. Mr. Welsteed, pastor of this church, ordered, on his deathbed, this flagon to be given as a token of the tender affection he bears towards us, 1753.' A coat of arms is engraved on it, but no motto. Stamped near the handle with the word ' BRIDGE.'

One smaller Flagon, no inscription. Stamped twice near the handle with the letters ' T.T.'

One large Cup, inscribed : ' A Friend's gift to the North Brick Church, 1730.' A coat of arms on the reverse side, and also stamped ' IG.'

One large Cup, stamped ' NRD.'

One large Cup, stamped ' IG.' and engraved on the bottom, ' 1731.'

One large Cup, stamped ' GH.'

One large Cup, engraved : ' Given by Nathaniel Loring to the New Brick Church, 1723-4.' Stamped on the bottom ' R.'

One smaller Cup, inscribed : Given by W. L. to the New Brick Church, 1723-4.' Stamped on the bottom ' R.'

One smaller Cup, stamped on the bottom ' GH.'

Two small Spoons, with holes in the bowls for strainers, stamped ' P.R.'

One large Dish, inscribed : ' The gift of Edward Hutchinson to the Second Church in Boston, May, 1711.'

One Dish to match, inscribed : ' The gift of Thomas Hutchinson to the Second Church in Boston, May, 1711.' A coat of arms on each dish, and both stamped ' EW.'

One Dish, same size, no inscription. Stamped ' EW.' A coat of arms engraved thereon, but different from those on the above dishes.

One Baptismal Basin, inscribed on the under side of the rim as follows, viz. : ' *Hoc Lavacrum Septentrionali in Bostonio Ecclesiæ adusum SS. Baptismi dedicatum est per Adamum Winthrop ad ortum primi sui Filii qui baptizatus est 18 August, 1706.*'

One Silver Bread Knife."

THE FESTIVAL.

[WRITTEN BY ONE OF THE COMMITTEE OF PUBLICATION.]

On Tuesday evening, June 17, a social Commemorative Festival was held under the direction of the ladies of the Society.

After the company had assembled in the church, a short address was delivered by the pastor, and an original hymn sung.

From thence they proceeded to the vestry, where a sumptuous entertainment had been provided. An invitation had been extended to all who had ever been connected with the ancient church; and the society had the happiness to welcome many friends from city and country who were formerly fellow-worshippers, and whose sympathies and affections still lingered around its sacred altar.

After some time had been spent in social converse, and in partaking of the refreshments furnished for the occasion, short and pertinent addresses followed, by gentlemen who were present. The pastor presided; suggesting, from time to time, themes for remark in regard to the many distinguished men and women who have been connected with the society, reading some quaint and interesting records from our ancient annals, and inspiring all present with a glow of congratulation and pleasure at the present prosperity and prospects of our time-hallowed church, upon the commencement of its third century. In addition to the remarks of the pastor, the following gentlemen successively addressed the assembly: Rev. Dr. Sharpe; Rev. Dr. Parkman; Rev. Frederick T. Gray; Mr. F. W. Lincoln, jun.; Rev. Mr. Muzzey, of Cambridge; and N. C. Betton, Esq.

On the walls of the vestry were hung the portraits of Increase Mather, Cotton Mather, Joshua Gee and wife, William Welsted, Ellis Gray, John Lathrop, Henry Ware, jr., and Gov. Hutchinson.

The vestry and tables were appropriately decorated with flowers furnished by friends in the country. Among the contributions was a barrel of bouquets from the members of the ancient Pilgrim Church in Plymouth, accompanied by the following note, which was read by Mr. Robbins, to whom it was addressed: —

“PLYMOUTH, June 17, 1851.

“My dear Friend, — Your grandfather planted many a seed in our ancient church, which could never die. Will you please to imagine that these flowers represent the unfading bloom of his faithful labors? I trust that you will not think our little gift an intruder among the contributions of your own people, and that you will accept it as an expression of our interest in a commemoration which must fill your heart with thankful memories and pure joy. — With my most cordial good wishes, to-day and always,

“Faithfully yours,

GEO. W. BRIGGS.”

The festivities of the evening were closed with singing the doxology, "From all that dwell below the skies," &c.; all returning home gratified with their participation in an occasion as rare as it was delightful, where the social feelings were hallowed by the spirit of our holy religion, and where the bond of union was sanctified by christian love. It was estimated that nearly one thousand persons were present during the evening.

On the afternoon of the succeeding day (Wednesday), the children assembled, and, in innocent hilarity and amusement, interspersed with the singing of appropriate hymns, passed a few hours. Many of them were accompanied by their parents and elder friends, who, participating in the exuberance of their youthful spirits, added grace to the occasion by their presence and sympathy.

The following is the original hymn referred to above, which was written by a lady of the parish : —

"Our fathers' God ! They sowed the seed in tears,
When spread around the howling wilderness ;
And now, the harvest of two hundred years
Their children meet in joy to reap and bless.

Two hundred years ! And still thy gracious power
This fold of Christ preserves with watchful care,
Sets the bright rainbow on the parting shower,
And gilds with sunshine clouds of past despair.

Two hundred years ! Unseen, a glorious cloud
Of heavenly witnesses are here to-night ;
Their silent anthem joins our chorus loud,
' Glory and praise to God above all height ! '

' Glory to God ! ' In Christ our living Head,
— Where thousand years are as a single day, —
The church below, with all the sainted dead,
Blessing and thanks to thee shall ever pay."

A P P E N D I X

TO

HISTORY OF THE NEW BRICK CHURCH.

F. — PAGE 171.

The aggrieved party first published "An Account of the Reasons why they could not consent to Mr. Peter Thacher's Ordination." A reply soon followed, entitled "Vindication of the New North Church from several Falsehoods, &c., by several of the Members of that Church." Increase Mather published "A Testimony to the good Order of the Churches," in which he censured the proceedings of the New North Church, as contrary to congregational principles and precedents. To this Messrs. Webb and Thacher replied, in a small pamphlet containing "A Brief Declaration in behalf of Themselves and their Church," &c.

It appears that it was reported that "a minister of the town" was concerned in getting up the first pamphlet mentioned above; or, at least, that he "overlooked and corrected the presswork whilst it was printing." The minister alluded to was Cotton Mather. The authors of the "Account," &c., have appended an advertisement to their pamphlet, declaring that "the report is utterly false," and affirming that "no minister in this town, nor in the whole world, ever saw or corrected one word of the whole."

I have quoted the answer of the dissentients to one of the reasons brought forward by the friends of Mr. Thacher, in justification of his removal from his parish at Weymouth. Their objections to other reasons are worth reading: —

"It is said, that others have done so before him. To this we answer thus: If they have, they have had better reasons to give than have been

given in this case; and, though they have, yet the hurt and evil that has been done thereby has outweighed, or at least balanced, the good.

"It is said he was unable to perform the work of the ministry in Weymouth, — particularly, visiting his parishioners. To this we answer thus: He did not serve an Egyptian task-master, that required the full tale of brick, without the least straw afforded. God does not desire, nor require, his ministers to do a work when they have no strength afforded them to do it: if Mr. Thacher did according to his ability, he would never be faulted for doing that which he had not no strength, power, or ability to do.

"It is said that Mr. Thacher complained of the little good he did by his preaching there; that there were no seals of his ministry; and hence his discouragement arose. To this we answer thus: 1. If he was faithful in his work, he need not doubt of a glorious reward hereafter, though he was very unsuccessful in it. So the prophet comforted himself: Isaiah, xlix. 4: 'Then I said, I have labored in vain, I have spent my strength for nought, and in vain; yet surely my judgment is with the Lord, and my work with my God.' And in verse 5: 'Though Israel be not gathered, yet shall I be glorious in the eyes of the Lord, and my God shall be my strength.' 2. God must be waited on, and not prescribed to; the Spirit worketh as it pleaseth; the wind bloweth where it listeth, and we hear the sound thereof, but cannot tell whence it cometh, or whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit. Though a minister toils all night, and taketh nothing, — yet, for aught he knows, in a little time he may have many for his joy and crown of rejoicing in the day of the Lord.

"It is said that Mr. Thacher came to Boston for the delight and benefit of conversation. To this we answer thus: If he be so bright a man as he is said to be, then the need of conversation to brighten him is so much the less, and more inconsiderable. Notwithstanding this reason for his removal, yet he ought not to have left that church, over which the Holy Ghost had made him overseer, for his own delight and benefit; he ought to remain unto the end in that town which God, in his providence, had fixed him in."

Mr. Ware's opinion seems to me perfectly correct, viz.: "that the New North people wrote with most moderation, though they were clearly in the wrong; while the advocates of the New Brick, though on the right side, lost all command of their temper."

The *result* of Mr. Thacher's connection with the New North was certainly in the end favorable to the interests of that church, and justified the good opinion, formed by those who supported him, of his fitness for that place.

G. — PAGE 179.

The old clock, after various fortunes, fell into the hands of the auctioneer, in January, 1839. The following appropriate speech was written for the occasion of the sale, by some lover of ancient relics. It was *said* to have been read by the auctioneer; but for the truth of this statement I cannot vouch.

“Here is the relic of the early days of our country’s annals, a remnant saved; antique of its kind, and venerable for every association connected with its history;—the old church-clock, bearing a mark of patriarchal longevity in the date, that speaks it one hundred and eighteen years of age. Yet, while it has ticked and struck off the thousand and tens of thousands, who have looked on its calm face, into eternity, it is still in good time, and going! going!! going!!!

“Though its existence was begun in the land of kings, moved by the spirit of our pious fathers, it followed them to the land of pilgrims, and was consecrated to serve in the house of God, whom they came hither to worship as the children of his kingdom, and not as spiritual slaves to earthly despotism.

“This sober, ever-going clock came over in the days of caution and sanity. It came when a *sea-voyage* was a serious thing, and *religion* a serious thing, and a *church-clock* a serious thing. It counted the moments, while the minister of God was preaching, and his hearers listening, of eternity. It echoed his text, ‘Take heed how ye hear.’ Then was there real clock-work and order in men’s minds and principles. Vanity did not then stare this venerable monitor in the face, and study the while how to display its plumage. Avarice did not dare, under its measured ‘click,’ to be planning in the temple how to lay up goods for many years. Nor was pride then puffed up by the breath of its own nostrils, while this minute-hand was showing its duration cut shorter at the beat of every pulse.

“Now, who will let this venerable memento of those days be desecrated? Who will not wish to possess himself of it, as a relic of the age of simplicity and godly sincerity?

“Look at its aged but unwrinkled face. It is calm; for it has not to answer for the sermons it has heard. Look at it, ye degenerate sons of New England! Do ye not seem to see the shade go back on the dial-plate to the days of your fathers, and to hear the voices of those aged servants of God who went from their preaching to their reward?

“I would speak more; but the hour is come. To whom shall it be sold?”

H. — PAGE 183.

The names of the twenty-four persons who first associated for the building of the New Brick, and purchased the land, were the following: — Alexander Sears, Solomon Townsend, John Waldo, Owen Harris, James Tileston, Nathaniel Jarvis, Thomas Lee, Jonathan Mountfort, William Arnold, Benjamin Edwards, Peter Papillon, Thomas Dagget, Daniel Ballard, Robert Gutridge, Robert Oring, Edward Pell, Samuel Burnell, Francis Parnall, Thaddeus Macarty, James Barnes, James Pecker, James Halsey, Ebenezer Bridge, Ephraim More.

The building committee consisted of John Frisel, Thomas Lee, Jonathan Mountfort, Alexander Sears, James Tileston, James Pecker, and Edward Pell.

The following persons gathered into a church-state, viz.: Alexander Sears, Solomon Townsend, William Lee, Nathaniel Loring, Moses Pierce, Daniel Pecker, Josiah Baker, Henry Wheeler, John Waldo, James Tileston.

“July 19, 1722. — It was agreed upon and voted that the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper should be administered in the revolution of every fourth sabbath from August 12, 1722.”

The services at the ordination of Waldron were as follows, viz.: Mr. Sewall offered the introductory prayer; Cotton Mather preached from 1 John, iv. 7; Increase Mather gave the charge; Mr. Wadsworth, the right hand of fellowship; and Mr. Waldron closed with prayer.

William Waldron was a descendant from the family of Cutts, from which have sprung many distinguished persons, and the members of which have intermarried with some of the best families in New England. His father, Col. Richard Waldron, was first married to a daughter of John Cutts, President of New Hampshire. His mother was Elinor Vaughan, also a descendant from the family of Cutts. His brother Richard was Secretary of New Hampshire. His sister Abigail married Col. Saltonstall,

of Haverhill, Mass. His only daughter became the wife of Col. Josiah Quincy, of Braintree, Mass. The Lowells of Boston are also descendants of the family of Cutts. Our pastor married Eliza Allen, of Martha's Vineyard. He was born 1697, and died Sept. 20, 1727, aged thirty-one.

“Aug. 23, 1725. — Voted, that Mr. Waldron be supplied with constant help for six months next ensuing from this day.

“Feb. 28, 1726. — Voted, that Mr. Waldron be supplied with help until the annual meeting in July next.

“Feb. 6, 1727. — Voted, that Mr. Waldron be paid out of the treasury thirty shillings per week, besides his stated salary, until the annual meeting in July next.”

Such votes were often passed “whilst there was but one minister, it being thought that the strength of one was inadequate to the whole duty.”

Mr. Waldron's salary was continued to his widow for four months and a half after his decease.

I. — PAGE 184.

Mr. Welsteed's ordination took place on the 27th of March, 1728. “Mr. Sewall and Mr. Cooper prayed before and after the sermon. Mr. Welsteed preached. Mr. Walter gave the right hand of fellowship, and Dr. Colman the charge.”

Mr. Welsteed married a sister of Governor Hutchinson.

“Nov. 18, 1728. — The Rev. Mr. Welsteed being about marrying, and as there will arise the charge of house and fire-wood thereby, voted, that there be allowed him seventy pounds a year out of the stock.

“Feb. 11, 1733. — Voted, to add four persons to the Standing Committee, viz. : the Rev. William Welsteed,” &c.

The letters of Waldron are some of them interesting. I have thought it not out of place to insert here a few extracts from some of them, relating to the circumstances and men of his times.

DESCRIPTION OF PROFESSOR WIGGLESWORTH.

“And this leads me to Mr. Wigglesworth, whom your preposterous managements have obliged me to mention after Mr. Welstead. I must needs say I can’t in justice imagine that this good gentleman is second to any. He is certainly *a* first rate, if not *the* first rate. His body is the less acceptable part of him, and that is in no wise to be despised. As for his intellectual powers, his being chosen into the professorship by some of our wisest and best men must speak him superlative. As for his public preaching, you would guess him almost to be under an inspiration in it. His delivery is with great deliberation and distinctness. He has a small, still voice ; not loud, but audible. As for the impediment you mention, it is only a graceful lisp that does not at all affect his speech to make him unintelligible. When I have heard him preach, I never observed but that every syllable was clearly articulated. And as for his never being a candidate for the gospel-ministry, it is a mistake. He always was so, ever since he preached, and is so now. He has been in nomination (though I don’t so well approve the method) more than once ; and the reason why he has been neglected is owing only to the ignorance and unskillfulness of the rabble, which make the majority. They disgust every thing but noise and nonsense, and can’t be content to sit quiet unless their auditory nerves are drummed upon with a voice like thunder. His meeting with no acceptance is a great reproach upon the understandings of the multitude. I guess he would hardly be prevailed to leave his business here only to make a fruitless journey ; for I don’t think he has any thing in prospect—I mean a settlement—any further. The learned this way would be loath to part with him. He is treated with great respect this way ; and, should he come to Portsmouth, your clergy, though his seniors, must stoop to him. As for his deafness, I look on it as a good ministerial qualification. Mr. Prince is an excellent preacher ; a fine scholar ; has but an uncouth delivery. He is raw and uncultivated ; not much of a gentleman. I should, for my part, pretty much suspect his conduct ambug you. I asked the professor whether, if he should be asked to preach anywhere for a small term, he would leave his business, and mentioned Piscataqua to him. He replied that he should consult the president in such an affair. But he added, ‘I believe it will be best for them to hear only one.’ He is a very prudent man ; and I am confident, that, if he had been sent to after the same manner that Mr. Welstead has, he would not have come ; and yet he is an humble, meek, modest man.”

“The other day I was in at Mr. Colman’s ; Mr. Cooper was there too. After other talk, we fell upon Piscataqua ; they asked how matters stood there. I told them I heard that there were some of you inclined to hear the professor ; and, said they, then they ’ll have him, if they are a

people of any taste and relish, which they determined that you were ; and I must needs say that it is now a critical juncture ; and the professor's office seems to be so clogged and cumbered, that a good settlement would, I believe, draw him from his professorship. His salary is but eighty pounds ; though Mr. Colman, who is one of the corporation, says his endeavors shan't be wanting to advance it to one hundred and twenty pounds per annum. The professor is not one of the corporation, which seems necessary, not only to dignify his office, but also to the faithful discharge of the duties of it. He has been chosen into the corporation, but disaccepted by the overseers, for no other reason, that I know of, but in contradiction to them that elected him ; for you know that there is no harmony between the overseers and corporation. He is on all hands allowed to be a meek person, and I apprehend that in a short time that matter will be reconsidered, and he allowed and confirmed ; when, if an advanced salary follows, I fancy he will be seated and fixed. No such suitable person as he can be found for that business."

MEETING OF THE OVERSEERS OF THE COLLEGE.

"Last Wednesday (dated October 14, 1723), the overseers paid a visit to that venerable lady, our Alma Mater. Their business was an inquisition into the state of affairs ; and we found things not to be so well as we could have wished. Mr. President endeavored to beat off the design's proceeding, but was conquered. When night approached, the wind and rain were perpetual ; and it was proposed and agreed upon to tarry the night over, and perfect the business,—for entry only had been made. While the matter of a tarry was agitating, Mr. President takes leave, and bids good night. One of the overseers told him that we intended to proceed in business, and expected that he would not leave us. To these he gave some short, slight, contemptuous reply, and went off. This then raised the resentment of many ; and they talked, with heat and warmth, of Mr. Leverett's unworthy treatment of them, and of sending over to him to require his attendance, &c. Mr. Appleton, your classmate, stood by all this while, and at length took occasion to drop off. 'Twas guessed, and he could not deny it, that he had been over to inform Mr. President how things stood ; for the president came over in a very little time, in the utmost good humor, and sat till the matter was entirely finished, and then invited several over to take a lodging with him,—with whom your unworthy brother was numbered, but did not go. Thus I have given you a summary of that visitation."

MR. GEE'S ORDINATION.

"On Wednesday last, the ordination of Mr. Gee was proceeded in. The affair was carried on with so much seriousness and awful reverence, that, if I had been wavering about the validity of our ordination before, I should have been then fixed and established by the solemnity and religious

devotion visible in all parties at the sacred action. Every man's soul seemed to be in it."

CHRIST CHURCH.

"Yesterday (December 30, 1723), the new church at this end of the town was met in, though very much unfinished. People flocked to it in abundance. What made them so hasty to improve it, as I am informed, was because Dr. Culter's salary was not to begin till he began to preach there. There seems to be a considerable strangeness between Harris and Culter, as well as a great dislike of one another; and there seems to be a breach among their people."

REV. MR. ROGERS, OF PORTSMOUTH.

"I know not how to begin to condole the sad state of poor Portsmouth, in the awful breach made upon them in the death of the renowned Rogers, — so every way valuable and worthy. You hardly yet begin to feel his loss. I think no man would have been missed so much as he in all your province. The ministry, in his death, have a breach made upon them, wide like the sea. He was their head. But, alas! their crown is fallen. I seem to feel a heavy share in his loss. The news of his death was as sadly affecting as any I have heard. What shall I say of him? My father, my father! may Heaven furnish a successor for you that may inherit much of his spirit! Please to let me have an account of his funeral. He deserved to be buried in the city of David, among the kings. When he died, a great man fell in Israel."

MR. WIGGLESWORTH'S "SOBER REMARKS."

"Here are some sober remarks published upon a book called 'A Modest Proof of the Order and Government settled by Christ and his Apostles in his Church.' The answerer is Master Wigglesworth, — though it is a secret, and must be concealed. Notwithstanding, *you must not think them all made by the same hand.* Where there is any bitterness shown in them, — where there are any ungentlemanly jeers, — that excellent man utterly disclaims them. But the most ingenious and argumentative part of the book is his. But I really entreat you not to mention this on any account; for he is greatly solicitous of having the matter remain a secret. He industriously conceals himself; and there are but three or four, at most, who know any thing about it."

SALUTE ON SUNDAY.

"The man-of-war fired her guns yesterday (October 19, 1723). It was the Lord's day, and the king's coronation-day. Methinks we had better spare an empty compliment to an earthly prince, than to affront the King of kings, and bellow out our profanations of his holy day."

I. — PAGE 189.

In 1736, the society were desirous of settling a colleague with Mr. Welsted. There had recently arrived in Boston, Mr. William Hooper, a native of Scotland; "a man of more than ordinary powers of mind, of a noble aspect, an eloquent, popular preacher."* The society were much attracted by his gifts; and, contrary to the advice of Mr. Welsted, extended to him an invitation to settle with them. His reply is preserved amongst our church-papers.

Mr. Hooper was afterwards ordained over the West Church, on the 18th of May, 1737. That church was formed on his account. He continued its pastor for nine years, when "he abdicated without a formal resignation, and went to England to receive Episcopal ordination." He afterwards returned to Boston, and became pastor of Trinity Church.

Mr. Gray was ordained, Sept. 27, 1738. The services commenced with prayer by Mr. Welsted, Dr. Cooper "being providentially hindered." Mr. Gray preached from Isaiah, vi. 5—8; Mr. Webb made the prayer after the sermon; Dr. Colman gave the charge, and Dr. Sewall the right hand of fellowship. The Rev. Nehemiah Walter joined in the imposition of hands.

Edward Gray, the father of Ellis, came to this country from England at the age of thirteen. He served his time with Mr. Barton, at Barton's Point (so called after him), as a rope-maker. Dr. Chauncy preached a sermon on the occasion of his death, which took place July 2, 1757, in the eighty-fourth year of his age. He speaks of him in the highest terms of eulogy, which, he says, "cannot, as is usual, disgust any one, as being esteemed a compliment to the dead, but rather as his just character, since he was a person so unexceptionable, so unenvied, unless for his goodness, and so universally well spoken of, both while living, and now he is dead." He married twice. His first wife was

* Dr. Lowell's Historical Discourse.

named Harrison, by whom he had six children; one of whom, named Harrison, was treasurer of the Province, and left Boston with the British troops, March 17, 1776, as did also his son. His daughter married Samuel A. Otis, father of the present Harrison Gray Otis.

On the death of his first wife, he married a Miss Ellis, — a niece of Dr. Colman's wife. Dr. Colman sent for her from England, with a view to this marriage. By her he had five children, of whom the oldest was our Ellis Gray. He married a lady by the name of Tyler. Their daughter married Mr. Carey, late of Chelsea, one of whose daughters was the second wife of the late Rev. Dr. Tuckerman. A grand-daughter married Judge Wilson, one of Washington's first District Judges of the United States Court; another, Joseph Hall, late Judge of Probate for Suffolk County. Dr. Thomas Gray, of Jamaica Plain, was a nephew of Ellis Gray.

“Voted, to raise a sum of money in such way as shall be thought most proper, for a present to our reverend ministers.”

Votes of this sort occur very frequently.

Mr. Gray died at the age of thirty-seven; Mr. Welsted at fifty-seven. Their portraits hang in the rooms of the Historical Society. The bills of their funeral expenses have been preserved. For Mr. Gray's funeral were subscribed eight hundred and sixty-eight pounds. The charges were six hundred and fifty-three, and two hundred and fifteen were given to his widow. Some of the items are as follows: “Wine, rum, pipes, tobacco, — ten pounds. Shoes and cloggs. Hose and gloves” to a very large amount. “Necklace for the negro. A large beaver hat for Mr. Welsted. Three ditto for Mr. Gray's two sons and negro. Fifteen candles. Black shoe-buckles.” A great many “gold rings. Handkerchiefs. A light gray bob wig for Mr. Welsted. Tolling six bells,” &c. &c.

“The first bell was hung in 1743, and the same year the meeting-house was for the first time painted. This bell was removed and sold in 1780; and the bell of the Old North, which was larger, was hung in its place. It was injured in 1792, and forbidden to be rung, except in case of fire, till it was re-cast, in the same year, and was the first bell from the foundry of the late Paul Revere, Esq., which appears by the following inscription upon it: ‘The first bell cast in Boston, 1792, by P. Revere.’” — *Note to Mr. Ware’s Century Sermon.*

K. — PAGE 191.

Dr. Pemberton was chosen Dec. 31, 1753, by a unanimous vote of the church, and by fifty-four votes of the congregation, two persons not voting. The arrangement of services at his ordination has not been recorded.

“July 10, 1759. — Voted, that the Standing Committee be desired to wait on his Honor, the Lieutenant-Governor Hutchinson, to invite him to sit in the fore seat, and that a cushion be made for his use.

“May 26, 1766. — On a motion made and seconded respecting making our elders’ seat and the deacons’ seat into one, as it has lately been done at Mr. Cooper’s and the Old North Churches, it was voted unanimously, that it be done as soon as may be; and that some persons go with a carpenter and see how the alteration is at the Old North and Mr. Cooper’s, that so ours may be done in the most convenient manner.

“July 14, 1767. — Voted to have electrical points or wires put up on the steeple.

“March 16, 1769. — Last night died Deacon Lee, aged ninety. He was one of the first deacons of this church from the year 1721, and one of the forty proprietors that built the meeting-house. He outlived all his brethren that were the original founders of this church.

“1763, Aug. 31. — On hearing that the Rev. Mr. Whitefield is soon expected, the committee voted unanimously that our pastor be desired to invite him to preach in our meeting-house as often as may be convenient, as the committee apprehend it will be agreeable to the greater part of the people.”

An attempt was several times made to settle a colleague with Dr. Pemberton. In 1763 Mr. Tennant was selected for this office, and some action of the church was taken in regard to him; but “he went off, and so the matter dropped.”

At the close of the year 1770, Mr. Isaac Story was desired by the church to preach as a candidate, and to settle. Dr. Pemberton did not approve of this choice.

Mr. Story was afterwards settled at Marblehead, and Dr. Pemberton preached his ordination-sermon.

L. — PAGE 192.

Dr. Pemberton had three wives: one named Penhallow, of Portsmouth; another, Powell. It is said there is a portrait of him at E. P. Cady's, at Plainfield, Conn. He died at the age of seventy-two.

M. — PAGE 193.

At the time when Dr. Stillman and Dr. Pemberton preached alternately in the pulpit of the latter, the custom was to take up a contribution for the payment of the minister's salary. Both the ministers received their pay from the same box. The money intended for each was so marked; and all the unmarked money was divided equally between them.

Dr. Pemberton's salary often fell short of the amount agreed upon. He relinquished most of his demands against the parish, and was very liberal to it.

N. — PAGE 199.

Deacon John Tudor was a very valuable and efficient officer of the church and proprietors. Amongst other donations, he gave the sum of five hundred dollars for the support of singing. Every matter of interest relating to the affairs of the church and congregation was carefully recorded by him. The greater part of the votes and other records which I have copied from the books of the New Brick Church, up to the year 1781, are in his handwriting.

As an instance of his accuracy and fidelity in relation to the records, I will refer to a single additional entry of his in the church-book in the year 1772. It seems that Deacon Lee, his predecessor in the office of treasurer, had omitted to give an account of the manner in which he had disposed of a certain sum of money collected, and put into his hands. Deacon Tudor explains the transaction, and justifies Deacon Lee by the following records. He writes :—

“There was a collection, I remember, in many of the congregational churches in 1739 to defend a lawsuit unjustly brought against Mr. Torrey, the minister of South Kingston, in order to recover the parsonage estate possessed by Mr. Torrey. The estate was left by a gentleman for the support of an orthodox minister of said Kingston ; and, as I remember, one Doctor M'Sparrow, a church-minister, took it into his head that *no minister was orthodox unless he was ordained by a bishop*, &c. &c. ; so, by the help of some no better than himself, he brought an action to recover the estate for himself and successors ; but he failed in his unjust prosecution.”

Deacon Tudor also pasted into the church-records a receipt for thirty-five pounds ten shillings from the New Brick Congregation for the use of Mr. Torrey in this suit, from Deacon Lee, signed by Dr. Benjamin Colman.

When Deacon Samuel Parkman left the church, to unite himself with the New North, under the pastoral care of his son, votes were passed expressive of the high regard entertained for his services ; and a beautiful and costly silver pitcher was presented to him, with the following inscription :—

Presented May 25, 1824,

TO SAMUEL PARKMAN, ESQ.

IN MEMORY OF

HIS FAITHFUL SERVICES AND DEVOTED FRIENDSHIP,

FOR A LONG SERIES OF YEARS,

AND IN VARIOUS OFFICES.

The following memoranda from the records of the New Brick Church are perhaps worth recording: —

“1779, August 2. — Received from Mr. Thomas Hitchborn, who had the care of it, a red velvet pulpit-cushion and case. *Note.* — This cushion was delivered to Brother S. Austin, and sold to the first church in Hingham for six cords of wood, which, on November 13th, was brought up and carted to Mr. Lathrop’s house.

“1779, July 29. — The Committee met; but, by reason of a most extraordinary affair that came before the body of the people at their meeting at Faneuil Hall, viz. a great number of prisoners being in town in prison, and on board three or four guard-ships, had laid a plot to break jail, &c., set the town in flames, and run off with some vessels, — therefore the Committee adjourned.”

The subjoined notes show the very high price of wood in 1780, and also the great depreciation of the currency: —

“1780, January. — *Note.* — The Committee desired me (J. Tudor) to get, if I had any opportunity, a small parcel of wood for Mr. Lathrop, on my wharf, for the present, hoping it will soon be cheaper. They ask three hundred dollars a cord out of a small sloop that lays at my wharf. But the people will not give it, only a few from necessity. But I got half a cord of south-shore wood, as Mr. Lathrop was out.

“1780, March 28. — Agreed to let Mr. Cunningham have the two old Connecticut stones that lay on the Old North land for half a cord of wood, to be sent to Mr. Lathrop.”

In December, 1780, two thousand pounds were raised to purchase Dr. Lathrop’s winter wood.

“The meeting-house was on fire at the south-east end, and burnt through the roof, from the fire from Hitchborn’s, &c. The south part caught when Dr. Clark’s great barn was burnt. The steeple caught when the joiner’s shop was burnt opposite to it, and the top in danger several times; after which we put on a turret, and, through the favor of the great Head of the church, it has been preserved to this; July, 1779.”

“1781. — The tub of the Old North engine, then the largest in Boston, was brought into the meeting in order that a child about ten years old might, at the particular request of the mother, be baptized by immersion.”

The parsonage-house for Dr. Lathrop was built on the land formerly occupied by the Old North Meeting-house. Subscriptions were obtained to assist in the purchase of it.

N.B. — A considerable amount of matter, for which I have not been able to find room here, may be seen in the Appendix to my Historical Sermons, preached March 10, 1844.

The following wood-cut, representing the New Brick Church, has been introduced at the desire of some of the older members of the Society: —





Bancroft Collection.
Purchased in 1893.

